


NUNC COGNOSCO EX PARTE



TRENT UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2019 with funding from
Kahle/Austin Foundation

The Canadian Historical Association

Report of the Annual Meeting
Held at Montreal,
June 1-2, 1944

With Historical Papers

Edited by R. M. SAUNDERS

TORONTO
THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO PRESS
1944

CANADA IN THE MAKING

Presidential Address by GEORGE W. BROWN
The University of Toronto

IN a moment of exuberant introspection about the American temperament and the temperament of New York in particular, the *New Yorker* some months ago made the following remarks:¹

One thing we know—there will be no token bombing of New York. An air raid or two, yes, probably, but whether Hitler's intention is to bomb us or just to prove that he *can* bomb us, we New Yorkers will make of the occasion something too stupendous to be dismissed with the feeble adjective "token." If even one German plane flies over and drops one bomb, vast and unpredictable upheavals will take place. We may all plunge into whichever river is handier, like lemmings, or we may equally well embark on a bender, or *kermesse héroïque*, with record throngs in Times Square and the velvet rope up at all the night clubs. We aren't Londoners, and it's no use pretending we are. You can't get a preview of the New York raid by reading "Digging for Mrs. Miller." (We'd get Mrs. Miller out of the rubble all right, but not without holding a monster Mrs. Miller Benefit at Madison Square Garden.)

Canadians also indulge in introspection. Indeed they seem in recent years almost addicted to it if one may judge from a stream of books, articles, public opinion polls, and radio discussions. On the whole, however, it is a gloomy business; there is no exuberance in it, certainly no exhilaration. "Sometimes," writes a Canadian novelist, "I think a Canadian is like a man wandering around a big city feeling very insecure because he has not been able to get a card of identity from the police. At any moment he is apt to be picked up by the cocksure and hard-faced people who run the world and be compelled to tell who he is and what he is doing on the earth, and he'll have to explain that he has lost his papers. In his heart he'll know that his inquisitors don't believe him; they'll see clearly that he's bluffing; they'll see that he simply lacked the confidence to go around to the proper authorities, and demand a card of identity."² At best it appears from such efforts in self-analysis that we have developed, or gone far toward developing, a kind of type, which on examination turns out to be a dull, though worthy, combination of virtues and frustrations. Canadians, we are told, are industrious, thrifty, and reliable, but cold, cautious, conservative, and lacking in initiative and imagination. Carrying around a terrific load of inhibitions, they are, as compared with their American neighbours, less sentimental and spontaneous, perhaps more dependable, but nevertheless wanting in power of decision and magnetism of personality.

When we turn to Canada, rather than Canadians, we get the same impressions of uncertainty. No question is more persistently perplexing to Canadians than Canada itself. For three-quarters of a century Canada has been an expression on the map, a half continent stretching from sea to

¹*New Yorker*, April 3, 1943.

²Morley Callaghan, "What It Means to Be a Canadian" (*Chatelaine*, July, 1943).

sea. But what, if anything, has it been more than that? Has it as a nation achieved anything distinctive in personality or culture, or is it no more than a sort of artificial political contrivance, as Goldwin Smith argued, put together in defiance of geography and economic interest and kept together merely by the perverse stupidity of people who refuse to recognize realities? "Caught in the swirl of this vibrant epoch of history," writes a Canadian journalist, "we find ourselves dull and lacking in pride and confidence. Perhaps we are not a nation. Perhaps we are merely a series of communities stretched across a vast continent, like a lot of black specks, struggling but static, on a field of fly paper." The language may change from one decade to another, but the mood continues, an apparently ineradicable element in Canadian thought.

Canada, indeed, seems to show an extraordinary reluctance to grow up, a kind of incurable adolescence which drags on from one generation into another. Judged by some of the most commonly accepted standards of nationalism, we have deficiencies which seem to outsiders, even those who know us best, inexplicable. We lack, through our own inhibition, some of the conventional marks of nationhood, such as the technical right to amend our constitution. We make the mystery of symbolism doubly mysterious by refusing, in such matters as that of a flag, to reach clear-cut decisions which would bring symbolism into line with reality. We have a genius for indirection, for refusing to let our right hand know what our left hand is doing, or at least for refusing to let them both get out into the open at once. Unlike other nations, moreover, we draw little inspiration either from ideology or national tradition. In contrast with our American neighbours, we have little faith in abstract statements of rights or in written guarantees of our liberties and ways of life. So little, on the other hand, do we regard history as an inspiration of national thought and action that we display an almost total disregard of it in any national sense. History is still commonly thought of in Canada as the preserve of the antiquarian, as a proper ornament or decoration for a respectable society, but with little practical consequence in revealing the realities or direction of national development. Outside an extremely narrow academic circle, we make little attempt either to study or teach it effectively. Nor do we think enough of it to preserve with any consistency the materials on which it is based. With a few honourable exceptions we treat the records of our past with neglect, even to the point of detriment to the public interest. The records of governments, the papers of public men, have shared this unenviable distinction almost equally with other materials of less obvious importance. Few countries with any claim to national pride would be content with such a condition.

These are but a few illustrations of Canada's apparent failure to reach a maturity which is satisfying to her people. Always she seems on the threshold of something which she never quite reaches. Always she seems entangled by the same confusion of spirit, the same hesitation and uncertainty, the same pre-occupation with her deficiencies. On the verge of growing up, she seems unable to shake off the last vestiges of adolescence, and insists on carrying about with her the adolescent's qualms as to the present and fears as to the future.

Is this, however, the whole story? Surely to state the case in its extreme form is to deny its validity, for have we not at the very least a paradox

of frustration and accomplishment? If we insist on the one we cannot close our eyes to the other. Canadians may take a certain gloomy satisfaction in "getting out their souls, propping them on their knees and staring into them to discover what's the matter with them," but the fact of Canada remains, and a very considerable fact it is. A people of scarcely more than four millions at Confederation, Canadians have spanned a continent and flung a network of highways and institutions across it. To ask us now to believe that Canadian history has no distinctive quality or meaning, that it has no definable lines of direction, that it begins nowhere and ends nowhere except as the tag end of someone else's story is to ask us to deny the plain evidence before our eyes. The great mass of Canadians have taken no such view. Whatever difficulties they may have had in defining or rationalizing themselves, they have very clearly been proceeding on the simple assumption that they could create a Canada, and that in fact they were doing so.

It is this persistence of purpose which demands explanation. Canada, we may remind ourselves, is the only country in the American hemisphere which has not in the last hundred years had a violent change in government or a civil war. The frustrations which have disturbed the Canadian spirit might have been predicted by anyone looking at the British North America of a century ago. The fundamental causes of them were obvious in the geography and history of its divided fragments. But who could have predicted with any assurance the persistent tendency toward nationhood? Durham, it is true, suggested the possibility of a united British North America, and other traces of similar sentiment can be found in the historical sources of a century ago. But against the background of division, misunderstanding, and bitterness of the 1830's and 40's these suggestions seemed no better than romantic bits of wishful thinking. Nationalism in spite of our familiarity with it, still defies exact explanation. It is a strange complex of variables, of ideas, attitudes, emotions, and interests which baffles the analyst. But, whatever one may say of it, one thing is certain. The nation must be something greater than the sum of its parts. If it is not so, it ceases to exist, it has lost the will to continue. By this elusive yet valid test, the Canadian people have created and are creating a nation. One cannot cross the boundary anywhere between Halifax and Vancouver without a consciousness that one has stepped into another environment of ideas, problems, and practices. These differences and distinctions stem back into the beginnings of Canadian history. They have been created by forces which run deep in Canadian experience, and there seems no probability of their disappearance in the near future. Canadians assume now more than they have ever done that Canada is taking her place among the nations of the world. They may differ as to the precise nature of her role. They may differ as to means and immediate objectives, but they take it for granted that she has, like other nations, her own part to play, and there is no evidence that they will voluntarily abandon that view.

Where then shall we find the distinctive elements, the permanent lines of direction, in Canadian development? It seems to me that they are to be found chiefly in the creation of Canadian institutions and attitudes, and in the course of Canada's external relations.

The creation of attitudes and of the institutions through which they

are preserved and expressed is the most familiar and pervasive, yet most elusive, process in the life of any people. "To understand in the best sense," wrote Mahan, "it is necessary not only to recognize the interests of a nation, but to enter as well into its feelings; tracing them where possible to the historic origin which once occasioned, and may still account for them." This is cultural history in its truest and broadest meaning, and it is only by a study of it that we shall explain those patterns of thought and action which are the most tenacious and characteristic elements in a nation's life and which largely determine the course of its development. From the beginnings of the first settlements, this process of creating attitudes and institutions can be seen working itself out in the Canadian environment. Men and women brought with them not only their material possessions, but their ways of life, their practices, prejudices, and ambitions, and here under the relentless pressure of geography and circumstance they moulded them into new patterns of thought and action. This is the process which has run through the whole of American history, and which has created with their similarities and differences all the varied societies of the New World. Canada has shared fully in this common experience. From her own background of European and American origins, she has like every other American nation created in her own environment, institutions fitted to her own needs and purposes.

So familiar are we, however, with this process that we take it for granted and underestimate the significance of results which seem commonplace to us. Thus, our political development has been a distinctive welding of British and American precedents. Its central element, the parliamentary principle, we have drawn from Britain, but into it we have of necessity moulded much that is American, until the product is *sui generis*. We have, for instance, been forced to adapt the parliamentary principle to the compelling pressures of federalism. In doing so we have rejected, in its typically American sense, the device of a written constitution based on theoretical concepts of the limitations of government and the division of powers, and have adhered rather to the concept of parliamentary sovereignty. Yet we have at the same time been forced in response to our own needs to accept a written constitution for the purely practical purpose of embodying the compromises on which Canadian federalism rests. Our approach to constitutional questions has been a pragmatic, not a theoretical, one. It has been one of ingenious adaptations hammered out under the pressure of necessity—not an heroic process certainly, but one whose results have on the whole served us well. Had it been the product of theory as seems to have been the case with the constitutions of some other nations, we might conceivably have gotten a great deal more emotional satisfaction out of it. But we seem not to be cast in that mould. By the same pragmatic token we have not carried constitution-making into the provincial field, unlike our neighbours of the United States, whose inalienable rights and privileges are buttressed by forty-eight state constitutions, varying in length and in definition of the citizen's fundamental rights but all revealing an unwavering adherence to the same patterns of political thought.

The parliamentary principle shows in Canada the effects of its environment, however,—the almost invariable practice of choosing representatives who are residents of their constituencies is but one of many examples. In this, as in a multitude of other cases, the Canadian point of view lies between

that of the United States and Britain. Parliament in Canada does not occupy the eminence in the public regard that it does in the British Isles. Membership in it has seldom been thought of as a career, certainly not as a career comparable in significance to that of success in business. Nevertheless Parliament is the centre of public life in a sense that Congress can never be in the United States, where the citizen is taught to put his faith in the written constitution rather than in elected representatives. The perversity and inherent disposition of elected representatives to betray the public interest are indeed almost assumed in the United States as a constitutional principle. This very real distinction between the Canadian and American points of view is intensified by the difference between the principle of cabinet responsibility and the principle of the division of powers. The one assumes the necessity of concentration of authority, the other the necessity of the conflict between executive and legislature. The one emphasizes the responsibility of the elected representatives: the other disperses responsibility so that in effect it lies nowhere except in the inevitable frictions of a complicated machine. It is not surprising, therefore, that in the United States much more faith has been put in the possibility of curing the ills of democracy by tinkering with the machine than has been the case in Canada. Devices like the initiative, the referendum, and the recall, have had little if any appeal in Canada, while the primary election and the problem of the long ballot are unknown.

Distinctions such as these might be followed through a score of familiar examples. Canadian political parties, for instance, in contrast with those in Britain, show the sharp and constant effects of sectionalism. Like those in the United States, they must try to be all things to all sections, until differences in principle are often whittled to the point of disappearance. They have, however, a continuity in leadership and a direct relation to government which are impossible in the American system, and are much more akin to English practice. A party once in power has a control of policy which no President even with a nominally favourable Congress enjoys. These distinctions and many others are worn deep in Canadian thought and practice.

Canadian economic development shows the effects of the same historic process, the mingling of forces running East-West and North-South, and working themselves out in the Canadian environment. Canada's economy is meshed in with that of this continent, but it is no less dependent on the markets of the wider world, and this is but the modern manifestation of long-established tendencies. The notion that Canadian interests all run North-South while only sentiments run East-West is a fallacy which contradicts the obvious facts of Canadian history. These divergent and balanced interests are, in fact, the framework within which the Canadian economy has been developed. It is no easy framework but without it there would have been no Canadian economy, and Canadians have adapted themselves to both its limitations and opportunities with the same persistent ingenuity which they have shown in their political difficulties. This is not to say that they have solved their problem. Geography, and its problem child, sectionalism, we have always with us. We never have had, certainly we have not now, an integrated and harmonious economy, and I am fully aware that academic realism is thought to lie in a diagnosis of aches and pains rather than in a record of accomplishments. Nevertheless, the fact

remains that Canadians have created an economy of distinctive quality; that they have developed the institutions and attitudes necessary to maintain it; and that at no critical point have they shown a willingness to abandon these purposes.

Canadian economic, no less than political, institutions are the product of hard compromise. They spring from individual initiative and enterprise not less than in the United States. But individualism in Canada always had a narrower stage than it had in the United States in the lush days of American expansion. Constantly it faced the pressures of a relentless American competition, even the dangers of complete absorption, and so was forced into the necessity not only of larger integrations but of close relations with government. From the days of the fur-trading companies and the first St. Lawrence canals to those of the Wheat Pools, the Bank of Canada, and the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, the history of Canadian transportation, finance, and business is studded with illustrations of this process. Canadian economic institutions are a strange and at times annoying mixture of private enterprise and public policy, but they are a very Canadian mixture, and they have shown themselves equal to tremendous strains in the past twenty-five years. In this respect the Canadian economy can bear comparison with that of any American country. Canadians, moreover, may remind themselves that they are not the only ones who have had to face the question of combining public and private interest. It is one of the central problems of our age, and Canada has, perhaps, in her own fashion gotten farther with it than Canadians realize. She has, under the unprecedented pressures of recent years, shown no small evidence of self-discipline, of ingenuity, and of willingness to support far-reaching measures necessary to the maintenance of her economic structure.

When we turn to other types of institutions, religious, educational, professional, we touch upon a field which has been largely neglected in comparison to the attention given to Canadian political and economic history, and in recent times even to the discussion of whether Canada has produced a distinctive art and literature. This neglect has obscured from consideration a network of institutions and relationships which has been woven inextricably into the Canadian fabric, and which exerts a continuous and increasingly powerful influence. Canadian churches, and universities, professional and other organizations, are a product of the same process which has produced Canadian political and economic institutions. They are a Canadian amalgam of ideas and practices drawn into the Canadian environment and adapted to its needs. In some cases their development is recent and immature, in others far advanced. In the case of the churches, it stems back into the pioneer beginnings of the country: in French Canada to the days of Champlain and the earliest missionaries; in English Canada to the establishment of the first settlements at various points. Proportionately the churches in Canada have played a much greater part than in the United States, and they provide one of the best examples of the process which we have been describing. Canadian Methodism, for instance, drawing divergent and conflicting elements from the United States, England; and Ireland, amalgamated them first into several Canadian Methodist churches, and then into a single, nationally organized church, which in turn under the pressure of Canadian conditions became part of a still larger United Church of Canada. In Upper Canada, where Methodism became peculiarly

entangled in all the stress and bitterness of the Rebellion years, its largest and most characteristically Canadian branch organized its own college, its own publishing house, and its own form of church government, and these were among the central institutions around which Canadian Methodism was later developed.

Canadian Presbyterianism followed the same patterns with characteristic infusions, as one would expect, of Scottish inflexibility, and even the Church of England, commonly thought to be much less amenable to Canadian influences, exhibits unmistakably the force of the same tendencies. No better proof of this can be found than the career of Bishop John Strachan himself, who turns out on examination to be a very Canadian figure indeed, prejudices and all. His innovation of the synod as an essential part of the governing machinery of the church is only one illustration of his willingness to make bold adaptations to the Canadian scene.

Canadian universities and Canadian education in general, while not easily defined or described in a few words, are equally the products of their environment. Drawing heavily, especially in their early stages, from the British Isles, from France, and the United States, they are none the less Canadian, and have reached the point where they are taking their place in the fraternity of scholarship in their own right. The contrast in the position of the liberal arts in Canada and the United States during the war years, for instance, has been by no means fortuitous. It is true that the difference is not to be explained solely in terms of a Canadian love for higher learning, but the significant fact remains that the liberal arts have been recognized in Canada as essential elements of war-time education, and the view has prevailed that we could not afford to throw them overboard in times of crisis. Canadian education, while deeply marked by influences which have affected education in the United States, shows like many other things Canadian, far less disposition to extremes. It is characteristic also of Canadian patterns that in recent years there has been a marked tendency, while preserving distinctive points of view and provincial differences, to develop organizations which are national in scope for the consideration of common problems. The Canadian Universities Conference, the Canadian Association for Adult Education, the Canada and Newfoundland Education Association, the Canadian Historical and Political Science Associations, the Canadian Institute of International Affairs, are among the bodies which provide channels of discussion cutting across geographical and sectional barriers. A limited population has paradoxically enough been not entirely a disadvantage in this respect, since, once initial obstacles have been overcome, it has been one of the factors tending to discourage the creation of too many regional and over-specialized organizations, and to encourage the bringing together from all parts of the country of individuals and groups representing widely varied opinions and interests. In a period when the central problem is increasingly one of harmonizing conflicting interests this is a fact of no small consequence.

What has been said about Canadian churches and education could be applied still more widely to the whole network of Canadian institutions and attitudes. Here a field, whose surface has only been touched, awaits investigation. In its details we still know little of the process which has woven these essential elements into the Canadian scene, for it is not to be studied merely in great affairs or in the lives of national leaders. In the

history of every local community we can see it going on as under a microscope—people of little consequence outside their own circle and beyond their own generation laying down patterns of thought and action, establishing practices of local government, attitudes to law and order, and the thousand and one other elements that enter into the fabric of every society. Who were these people, and especially the leaders among them, the doctors, clergymen, school teachers, and holders of public office; whence did they come; where were they educated; what did they bring with them of traditions and loyalties; how were they influenced, and what did they preserve in their Canadian environment? Some of the intangibles in this fascinating pattern of cultural history will always elude us. But we could know much, certainly far more than we do, and certainly enough to show why Canadian society, though it is woven of many threads and though it is incomplete at many points, is still a tough and resistant fabric. Perhaps we would then accept the essential Canada which we see before our eyes, and would cease being repeatedly surprised by the emergence of the same characteristics in one generation after another. Of Canada's history it is also true, *Plus ça change, plus ça reste la même chose!*

No pattern in Canadian history is more persistent than the survival within the Canadian framework of two cultures, French and English, and in no other respect is Canada more clearly distinguished from her American neighbours. Especially is this so in comparison with the United States, whose nationalism and democracy in spite of an emphasis on individualism, are marked by concepts of standardization sharply different from those in Canada. It is true that the union of French and English-speaking Canada is a marriage of convenience and always has been, but if it has lacked the glow of romantic attachment, it is none the less valid. The balance of interests which holds it together, may be precarious, but it has nevertheless withstood repeated and severe strains. The parties may not even know precisely what they have in common, but whatever it is, they have never been willing to give it up, and however little their satisfaction has been in living together they have shown even less disposition to live separately. Extremism in French-English relations we have always with us, and periodically it emerges in acute form, but no less persistently have Canadians refused to accept the extremist solutions either of separation on the one hand or of standardization in a single cultural pattern on the other.

These are facts, proven first in the days of the American Revolution and at point after point since that time, which Canadians should keep in mind when they consider their so-called racial problem (which is in reality not a racial problem at all), for on reflection it is not the disunity of Canada which impresses us, but the persistence of a determination to work within the Canadian framework. The marriage is indeed one not merely of convenience but of necessity. English, not less than French, Canada has had the determination to survive, the will to resist absorption, and only through this union could each achieve its purpose. At every crisis the intuition that this was so has prevailed, and no central fact in Canadian history has been more commonly overlooked. Is this to belittle the union? Surely not, for Canada's experience is not unique. It is but the Canadian version of a problem which forces itself relentlessly and increasingly on the modern world, the problem of harmonizing the particular and the general, of finding means for the preservation of special loyalties and interests within a frame-

work of wider co-operation. Human relations are not mathematical formulae to be worked out neatly and put on the shelf until needed. We do not solve them in any literal sense of the term, we live through them. By dint of effort and goodwill, we may even live through them constructively, and on the record, when all the evidence is in, Canadians may justly claim to have made no small progress in that direction.

If some sense of direction, some emergence of national purpose, are to be found in Canada's internal institutions, they are to be seen even more clearly in the history of her external relations. Yet here too we have had much confusion of thought, based on a failure to recognize obvious facts in Canadian history. Since Canadians have never, until recent years, thought of themselves as having a foreign policy, they have successfully obscured from themselves the fact that they have had in reality a policy of external relations whose essential principles have never varied. Those essential principles can be seen emerging even with the American Revolution, for the bits of British North America which were left swinging like fragments between the two great segments of the English-speaking world exhibited even in that period a determination to live their own lives, by refusing to be swept into the orbit of American nationalism on the one hand, and by reaching out towards the beginnings of self-government on the other. They were determined to find a place for themselves between Britain and the United States, and this they could only do in the long run by rejecting the extremes both of colonialism and continentalism. For more than a century and a half the rejection of these extremes has run like a red thread through Canadian history. It is the balance which has determined at every stage the character of Canada's external policy, and only by maintaining this balance has her growth to nationhood been possible.

Canada has of necessity, then, belonged to both the British and American worlds, and it was inevitable that if she were to grow to maturity she could do so only as part of an evolving empire. It is not by chance that at many points and in many ways Canada has been a bridgehead across the Atlantic from the days of Cunard to the days of the ferry command. This dualism is of the very essence of her history, an unavoidable quality in her development. Canada has never been an interpreter between Britain and the United States in any literal sense of that term, but she has occupied continuously an intermediary position, and that position she has never been willing to abandon. No more striking illustration can be brought forward than that of the present war, for Canada's adherence to the British Commonwealth in 1940-1 during the darkest months of the struggle was without question one of the determining influences in British-American relations, thus exerting an incalculable effect on the course of world events. Canada has indeed, at times, been a conditioning element in the relations of Britain and the United States. The situation has never been easy but neither has it been lacking in advantages and possibilities, and today the proof of that fact is Canada's distinctive place in the international scene.

The process by which Canada moved toward self-government within a changing empire was incapable of defence by any system of legalistic logic. It was not theoretical but pragmatic and intuitive and from the days of Durham was the work of leaders on both sides of the Atlantic whose understanding of the forces with which they were dealing transcended legalism.

Indeed the process is still incapable of legalistic defence, and the growth of responsible government which is a commonplace of Canadian history remains a mystery to those who have had no practical knowledge of it. No fundamental difference in political thinking marks Canada off so sharply from her American neighbours as this absence of the revolutionary tradition. To them, revolution and the assertion at one stroke of national sovereignty were the essential prerequisites of political growth, and the development of self-government without the revolutionary tradition is well-nigh incomprehensible. For Canada, the changing Empire of the nineteenth century was a framework within which the forces for nationalism were able to work toward fruition. No one will underestimate the strength of those forces, but it can scarcely be contended that they would have succeeded alone. Confederation itself was made possible by an Imperial Act, which the Fathers of Confederation, using a technique³ that was unprecedented, were themselves able to frame for submission to the British Parliament, and the full weight of British policy was thrown not only behind its acceptance but behind that remarkable series of decisions and accomplishments which within a generation carried the bounds of the new nation west and north to the Pacific and the Arctic. Canada gained self-government and an empire because she was herself part of an empire, and this astonishing paradox Canadians took for granted as if it belonged to the natural order. Almost invariably in fact they talked about relations with Britain as if they rested on sentiment alone, a distortion the unfortunate effects of which can be traced even to the present.

Nor have Canadians ever fully realized the importance of the part which they have played in the transformation of the Empire. That transformation from the mercantilism of the early nineteenth century to the free association of our own day has been one of the central facts in the history of the modern world and at every stage of it Canada's influence has been a powerful, sometimes a decisive, factor. Responsible government which transformed the Empire of the nineteenth century was in a very real sense a Canadian creation, and already it appears that in the sweeping changes which were ushered in by the War of 1914-18 and through which we are still passing, Canada's role and responsibility have been equally important.⁴ In the light of these considerations the significance of Canada's influence has gone far beyond her own borders or the limits of her own history.

The Empire in which Canada grew toward nationhood was, however, not merely an empire. It was with British sea power and finance the centre of the internationalism of the nineteenth century which has been well named the Pax Britannica. The Empire was, moreover, as the twentieth century opened, itself taking on the aspect of an international system within a wider world order in which there was a nearer approach to national self-determination and freedom of trade than at any other point in modern history. Canada grew therefore toward maturity not within the confines of a narrow imperialism but in reality within a world order in which she had a vital

³It had however been suggested in the discussions of the Albany Conference in 1754 when prominent colonial leaders felt it would be the only means of getting organic union among the Thirteen colonies. See L. H. Gipson, *The British Empire before the American Revolution* (5 vols., New York, 1942), V, 134-5.

⁴See J. W. Dafoe, "Canada and the Peace Conference of 1919" (*Canadian Historical Review*, XXIV, Sept., 1943).

stake. Already, even before 1914, she was, within the Empire and in her association with the United States, moving toward a practical internationalism based on the principles of mutual respect and co-operation, and this favourable development was not only a justification of her historic policy but was essential to her interest. Canada's interests are still fundamentally the same, and two world wars have served but to intensify and enlarge them. They are based on no narrow or theoretical concept of national sovereignty, they are opposed as they have always been to the triumph of regionalism, and they can realize themselves fully only in the creation of a genuine internationalism. By moving toward such a world order in association with other members of the Commonwealth, Canada will only be carrying to their logical conclusion tendencies which have run consistently throughout her history.

Such are the persistent patterns which run through Canadian history. But it is not merely their persistence which is needed to explain the Canada which we know—it is also the fact that they have been woven together in a complex relation both of conflict and interdependence. Canada is a product of the delicate balancing of diverse forces and problems. She has had to face at one and the same time the baffling difficulties of geography and sectionalism, the necessity of developing and harmonizing two types of culture, and the problem of reaching political maturity within a complex and rapidly changing network of external relations. Few countries have had to face so tangled a pattern and few countries have had so convincing a record of achievement. When Canadians exhort themselves, as they sometimes do, to be themselves, the answer is that that is precisely what they have been doing throughout their history with the utmost persistence and with no small result, and that there is no prospect whatever of them abandoning the habit.

Today, however, the stage has suddenly widened. Canada has been swept as never before into the centre of the international scene, and she finds that her problems are more and more those of the world at large. Both geography and history have given her a place of significance. She has come to nationhood at a moment when the groundswell of vast changes is felt throughout the world, and she will if she follows her true intuition and interest play a distinctive role in creating that community of nations whose existence is essential to any hope of ensuring international prosperity and peace.

SOME ASPECTS OF THE RELATIONS OF FRENCH CANADA WITH THE UNITED STATES

By MASON WADE

Quebec, P.Q.

KNOWLEDGE knows no boundaries; and the histories of Canada and the United States are so intricately interwoven that one cannot reasonably be discussed without the other, although, as C. P. Stacey has remarked, "Canadian writers have sometimes bent to the task with laudable determination,"¹ and Americans all too frequently display an appalling ignorance of their neighbour. Therefore it is regrettable that only in recent years has it been generally recognized that both Canadian and American historians are concerned with matters which are not so much national as continental in character, and that they might profit mutually by meeting together to discuss their findings. The annual gatherings at Queen's and St. Lawrence Universities will be resumed after the war, let us hope, and meanwhile the Carnegie series of studies in Canadian-American relations² has paved a way which might well be followed by more historians of both countries. Our nations have achieved through the years a harmonious collaboration without precedent in a world too long torn by outrageous nationalism; and the recounting of how that relationship was achieved is more fitting work for the historian than fanning the dying coals of ancient discords into new flames.

Within the time set aside, only some aspects of a relationship which goes back to the earliest days of New France and New England can be considered. Because French Canada is the most deeply traditionalist section of the New World, mention will be made of some of the earlier relationships which are usually neglected or not as well understood as they might be. In this attempt to present a fairly rounded picture within brief compass, only nominal notice can be given to some points, and only the barest outlines of others indicated. The discussion will be limited largely to Quebec and New England. Being a New Englander, I feel that my region has had a determining effect upon the development of the United States, just as Quebec has had a determining effect upon the development of Canada. That is a theory; it is a fact that Quebec is the core of French Canada and that the majority of the Franco-Americans—a larger group of people of French blood than is found in the whole French overseas empire³—dwell in New England. So I shall leave to those better qualified all but the most passing reference to the relations of French Canada with the United States, outside the field I have outlined.

I.

This subject was thought until recent years by most historians to be confined to the long series of French and Indian Wars, the Quebec Act,

¹C. P. Stacey, *Canada and the British Army, 1846-71* (London, 1936), 17.

²*The Relations of Canada and the United States* (New Haven and Toronto, 1937+), published under the auspices of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 21 vols.

³Josephat Benoit, *L'Ame franco-américaine* (Montreal, 1935), 232-3.

the American Revolution, the War of 1812, and the stormy middle years of the nineteenth century, which ended in the Confederation of the British North American provinces against the threat of a giant neighbour who had achieved unity through a civil war, and showed certain signs of a bumptious willingness to extend the blessings of the American way of life upon the rest of the continent, by force if necessary. Only within the last few years has it been generally realized that two-fifths of the French Canadians live in the United States; and that the continental economic system goes back to the earliest days of New France and New England. The basic factor of geography, which has determined so much history, has also been too long neglected. Only in 1941 was the first detailed examination⁴ made by French Canadians of the political and economic relationship of the two regions. Its most significant conclusions, and some others suggested by it, provide the framework of this paper.

The whole great area stretching from Labrador to Cape Cod was closest to the ports of England and France when those nations were rival maritime powers. It supplied a base for the exploitation of the rich fisheries of the Newfoundland, Nova Scotian, and Georges Banks in an age of faith and abstinence, when the European consumption of fish was far greater than in modern times. This coast was also the gateway to a continental treasure-house of furs, and from 1545 to 1850 the fur trade was one of the basic factors of the North American economy. The French, who came first, after throwing the seeds of settlement in Acadia, chanced upon what Cartier called the "chemin du Canada,"⁵ the "river and the road" of the St. Lawrence River system, which led them to a heroic series of discoveries. They bared the heart of the continent; they traced out the principal waterways and carried the Cross and the *fleur-de-lis* from the Atlantic to the Rockies, from Louisiana to Hudson Bay.⁶ The English spread out upon the Atlantic coastal plain. Barred from the interior by the wall of the Appalachians, they devoted themselves first to agriculture, then to the fisheries and to trade by sea. By 1700 the entire territory between the Appalachians and the Rockies might fairly be called French by right of discovery, if not of development, while only the narrow eastern seaboard strip was English. Then began a long struggle—primarily economic in character—between the two colonies, one of which had too much population for its limited territory, and the other too little for the vast expanses which it claimed. At the opening of the Seven Years' War, two million Anglo-Americans faced seventy-five thousand French Canadians;⁷ that simple fact, plus British sea power, settled the fate of New France. Though the Iroquois, the most powerful savage confederation of the East, generally supported the English, it is true that the French enjoyed the support of by far the greater part of the Indians, whose goodwill—so essential for the fur trade—they had won through a missionary effort which completely dwarfed New England's labours in that field.

⁴G. Lanctôt (ed.), R. Parent, B. Brouillette, J. Bruchesi, G. Robitaille, *Les Canadiens français et leurs voisins du sud* (Montreal, 1941). Hereafter cited as Lanctôt.

⁵J. Cartier, *Bref Récit et succincte narrative de la navigation faite en MDXXXV et MDXXXVI* (Paris, 1863), 16.

⁶A. L. Eno, "French Trails in the United States" (*Franco-American Historical Society*, Lowell, 1940).

⁷Lanctôt, 46-7.

One salient fact that is worth recalling from the complex history of this period is that the French were the first exploiters of the natural resources of the New World, as well as missionaries and explorers, while the English were the first colonizers and farmers, and only later traders by land and sea.⁸ There is little historical truth in the traditional opposition of a spiritual New France to a materialistic New England. Such little French colonization as took place was designed to assure the security of the fur trade, which was operated by monopolies for the sole benefit of the mother country. New France was ruled by Frenchmen from France for the benefit of France. On the other hand, the English colonists had turned their back upon their mother country, and they set about the creation of a New England upon an agricultural foundation which endured until the 1840's. Once that foundation was laid, they established a thriving trade with the West Indies, and even with the French colonies, neglected by a European-minded monarchy. Early in the history of the region, it became evident that geography could not be denied; since Acadia was a natural extension of New England, it became the first battlefield of the French and English in the New World; and it was the first section of New France, along with the outposts of Newfoundland and Hudson Bay, to pass into English hands. The age-old relationship of Boston with Acadia survives today; sometimes it would appear that there are more Maritimers in Massachusetts than at home, and Haligonians still talk of visiting the "Boston States."

After the Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle in 1748, France fortified the frontiers which were endangered by the expansion of the swollen population of the English colonies, adopting La Galissionière's plan of a chain of mutually sustaining forts, stretching from Acadia to Louisiana. The French thus set up, as M. Parent has it, "a Chinese Wall which shut in the English between the sea and the Appalachians."⁹ This was, of course, but the first of many such walls erected to preserve French Canada from outside influences, both good and bad. The English colonists promptly established a set of counter fortifications. Swayed by insistence from the colonies, London saw that the power of France might be broken on American battlefields. Money and men poured across the ocean to the English colonies under the protection of English sea power, already formidable; while France, fighting in Germany against England's continental allies, could spare few men and less money for the struggle in America. Parkman, in *A Half-Century of Conflict* and in *Montcalm and Wolfe*, was the first to show that obscure events in America could affect the course of events in Europe, as those in Europe did that in America. To him the struggle which was settled by the Peace of Paris in 1763 was one between feudal, militant, and Catholic France and democratic, industrial, and Protestant England.¹⁰ Remove the religious terms from this equation, and you might re-state it as the struggle between the past and the future; for feudalism and military government were doomed in North America before the mounting tide of democracy and industry, with which this study will be largely concerned.

That tide soon made itself felt. The English colonies grew rebellious

⁸R. Parent in *ibid.*, 89-90.

⁹*Ibid.*, 87.

¹⁰F. Parkman, *The Pioneers of France in the New World* (Boston, 1865), preface.

under economic restraints placed upon them by the mother country, whose military might had just removed the chief threat to their existence by the first great feat of combined operations.¹¹ They demanded a political and economic freedom which no colony had previously enjoyed, while the Albany and New York merchants who had hastened to Montreal to take over the French fur trade and other enterprises, soon came into conflict with the very military authorities who had invited their coming.¹² Opposition to military authority and antipathy to Catholics were the chief American influences felt by French Canada at this period, according to General Murray and Colonel Burton. His Majesty's old subjects displayed a growing and "strong Bias to Republican Principles"¹³ in Carlton's eyes; and Cramahé regretted that they had adopted "American Ideas in regard to Taxation."¹⁴ Acting on the opinion of Murray and Carlton that the new subjects were the best assurance of the survival of British power in North America, London saw fit to pass in 1774 the Quebec Act, which virtually established the Catholic Church as the Church of Canada; granted to the French their Civil Law, to the virtual exclusion of the English Common Law; and by restoring Labrador to Canada, re-established the northern economy.¹⁵ This Act, which is so closely connected with the American Revolution that consideration of one without the other has been described by Buxton as "*Hamlet* without the prince,"¹⁶ was a red rag to the colonial bull, already goaded into exasperation by repressive trade ordinances. The anti-"Popish" frenzy, which had reached its height in the American Colonies during the French and Indian Wars (which often took on the air of religious crusades, though they were really trade wars), exploded once more.¹⁷ In an "Address to the People of Great Britain" on October 21, 1774, the first Congress of the English colonies protested against this "worst of laws," which established a "religion that has deluged our island in blood, and dispersed impiety, bigotry, persecution, murder, and rebellion through every part of the world."¹⁸ Three days later the same body adopted a "Letter Addressed to the Inhabitants of the Province of Quebec," which sought to convince the French Canadians that their true interest lay in uniting with the English colonies in a struggle for liberty, representative government, and freedom from economic persecution.¹⁹ This letter was spread through the province by the Montreal merchants, British by origin but American by conviction, sentiment, or interest. It was followed up by other appeals, and by the agitation of such agents as John Brown. The French Canadians, a people just emerging from a feudal economy, got a lesson in revolutionary politics and laissez-faire economics,

¹¹E. W. McInnis, *The Unguarded Frontier* (New York, 1942), 41-2.

¹²A. L. Burt, *The Old Province of Quebec* (Minneapolis, 1933), 102-27.

¹³A. Shortt and Arthur Doughty (eds.), *Documents Relating to the Constitutional History of Canada, 1759-1791* (Ottawa, 1907), Carleton to Shelburne, Dec. 24, 1767, 201-3; cited Lanctôt, 96.

¹⁴*Ibid.*, Cramahé to Dartmouth, July 15, 1774, 353; *ibid.*, 96.

¹⁵D. G. Creighton, *The Commercial Empire of the St. Lawrence, 1760-1850* (New Haven, 1937); R. Coupland, *The Quebec Act* (Oxford, 1925).

¹⁶G. Buxton, *L'Influence de la révolution américaine sur le développement constitutionnel du Canada, 1774-1791* (Paris, 1929), 1.

¹⁷Sister Mary Augustina, *American Opinion of Roman Catholicism in the Eighteenth Century* (New York, 1936), 395.

¹⁸*Journals of the Continental Congress, 1774*, 88; cited Lanctôt, 98.

¹⁹*Ibid.*, 105-13; *ibid.*, 98.

for Adam Smith's *Wealth of Nations* appeared almost simultaneously with the Quebec Act and the American Revolution.²⁰ The new gospel of the *Bostonnais* caught the fancy of the masses, who did not welcome a return to the old system of feudal dues; while it was violently opposed by the *élite*, who were secured in their own position by the Quebec Act. The *élite* made capital of the double-faced attitude of the Congress, which had denounced Catholicism in England and praised freedom of conscience in Quebec. More influential than words, however, were the melodramatic capture of Ticonderoga in May 1775 by Ethan Allen, and Benedict Arnold's subsequent seizure of Crown Point and St. Johns. As Carillon, Fort Frédéric, and St-Jean, these bastions of the old invasion route were all too well known in Canada, and their fall did much to increase American influence.

There was much searching of hearts in Canada over the question thus raised. Carlton called out the militia, after urging Bishop Briand to summon them to arms, which that prelate did with all the more willingness, since England had just granted "l'usage de nos lois, le libre exercice de notre religion, et les privilèges et avantages des sujets britanniques."²¹ Threatened on the one hand by his spiritual leaders with the refusal of the sacraments, if he refused to meet the obligation of defending his country; and urged on the other to throw off the burdens of seigneurial tenure, "les fers de l'esclavage qu'on a tant pris de soin à polir," in the words of Congress' "Letter" of May 1775,²² and to join with the English colonies in the defence of the common liberty against British oppression, the French Canadian was undecided where to cast his lot. Noting that the majority of the old subjects at Montreal refused to enroll, he likewise refused, affirming a right of neutrality in what must have seemed an Anglo-Saxon family quarrel to a very newly British people. The contagion of Americanism was evidenced, however, in the fact that one of the chief objections to mobilization was an unwillingness to serve under the seigneurs, and another, the popular disapproval of the active part taken by the clergy in the British interest. It was remarked by good Catholic habitants that Mgr. Briand's proper role was to make priests rather than militiamen.²³

Meanwhile James Livingston, an American merchant of Chambly, circularized the militia captains with word that the Americans would abolish the tithe and the seigneurial dues re-established by the Quebec Act; and Ethan Allen launched a rhetorical bombardment in favour of French-Canadian neutrality. An American army under Schuyler and Montgomery came down Lake Champlain and established itself at Isle-aux-Noix in September 1775. One minority group of the French-Canadian masses was loyalist, another *congressiste* or *bostonnois*, while the majority tried to preserve a neutrality²⁴ whose bias was influenced by the shifting fortunes

²⁰The Quebec Act went into effect on May 1, 1775; John Brown was exceedingly active in Montreal at this time; and Adam Smith's *Wealth of Nations*, virtually completed four years before, was published in 1776 (Creighton, *Commercial Empire*, 56).

²¹*Mandements, lettres pastorales et circulaires des évêques de Québec* (Québec, 1888), II, 22 mai, 1775, 264-5; cited Lanctôt, 103.

²²Archives de Lotbinière, "Lettre du Congrès Général aux Canadiens, 1775, Mai ou Juin." Cf. *Journals of Congress*, May 29, 1775, 39; cited Lanctôt, 104. Abbé Louis de Lotbinière, a former Recollect, was chaplain of Livingston's French-Canadian regiment in the following year.

²³Lanctôt, 103. ²⁴*Ibid.*, 105.

of the contending parties. The French Canadians were a people worn out by a century of border warfare against heavy odds, and by the long effort to explore a continent and carry on a continental trade with a minimum of man power. They had become deeply attached to their land, and wished to dwell on it undisturbed by war.

Even the bellicose character of the *congressistes* was subject to sudden change, as Ethan Allen found at Longue Pointe, at the cost of three years' imprisonment, when he brashly attacked Montreal on September 25, 1775, with thirty Americans, and eighty Canadians. After a sharp skirmish with thirty British soldiers, some eighty to one hundred British volunteers (including Guy Johnson's Tory rangers from the Mohawk) and a hundred and twenty Canadians, the hero of Ticonderoga, the "Notorious New Hampshire Incendiary" as Governor Tryon called him, was forced to surrender with the thirty-one men who had not run in order that they might fight another day.²⁵ The ardour of the Loyalists was equally uncertain. Carleton, the friend of the French Canadians, who had written: "I think there is nothing to fear from them while we are in a state of prosperity, and nothing to hope for while in distress,"²⁶ fled to Quebec on November 12; and Montreal capitulated to Montgomery the following day. The residents accepted the union offered by their brothers of the colonies, with "même loix, même prérogatives, contribution par proportion, union sincère, paix permanente."²⁷ Montgomery, already busy about the raising of a second French-Canadian regiment (one had been enlisted under Livingston while the army was at St. Johns), judged the French Canadians much as Carleton had done: they "will be our friends as long as we are able to maintain our ground."²⁸ Up to the walls of Quebec in November, the American invasion of 1775 was a triumphal progress for Montgomery; while Arnold, after losing nearly half of his command in the rigorous journey up the Kennebec and down the Chaudière, was welcomed and provisioned by the villagers of the Beauce, when his men emerged from their epic battle with the wilderness.²⁹

The defeat of Montgomery and Arnold's joint New Year's Eve assault on Quebec started the decline of American prestige. In it the leaders were lost; Montgomery was killed and Arnold seriously wounded; and their successor General David Wooster's one success was a political one, when in February 1776 he ordered the holding of elections by the parish assemblies, in order that the holders of royal commissions might be replaced by those with Congressional authority. This introduced into Quebec the new idea of the people's right to choose its own chiefs, and the move was exceedingly well received throughout the province. The idea thus planted was to bear fruit in later years. The tide of French-Canadian opinion really turned against the invaders when cash ran out and the Americans resorted

²⁵J. H. Smith, *Our Struggle for the Fourteenth Colony*, I, 381-94; E. Allen's *Narrative of the Capture of Ticonderoga and of His Captivity and Treatment by the British* (Burlington, 1849), 12-13.

²⁶Carleton, cited in Chester Martin, *Empire and Commonwealth*, (Oxford, 1929), 140.

²⁷Sanguinet, "Journal," in Verreau, *Invasion du Canada* (Montreal, 1873), 80-5; cited Lanctôt, 107.

²⁸*American Archives* (Washington, 1840), 4, III, Montgomery to Schuyler, Nov. 19, 1775, 1681-2-3; cited Lanctôt, 107.

²⁹Smith, *Our Struggle*, I, 598-607.

to requisition or to payment in paper, which soon became inflated. Quebec remembered all too well the exactions of Bigot's régime, and the still unpaid French paper which was the mother country's legacy to its orphaned child. It also remembered that sea power had been decisive in 1759 and 1760; and since the invaders had been unable to take Quebec by storm, the French Canadians argued that they would be driven out in the spring, when the opening of the St. Lawrence brought British ships and reinforcements. The Congress realized the seriousness of the situation and sent three Commissioners, Benjamin Franklin, Charles Carroll, and Samuel Chase, to Montreal.³⁰ They were accompanied by the French-educated Jesuit, Father John Carroll (later the first American Catholic Bishop), and by the printer of Congress' "Letter to the Inhabitants" of 1774, Fleury Mesplet. Mesplet's press, intended to propagate American ideas in French, was two years later to give birth to the *Gazette littéraire de Montréal*, the French precursor of later French-Canadian journalism—an infant destined to a vigorous and sometimes boisterous manhood.³¹ But the Commission, hampered by the delays which occasionally make one despair of democratic procedure, only reached Montreal on April 29, while the British reinforcements reached Quebec on May 6, 1775. Father Carroll was not well received by the inflexibly royalist French-Canadian clergy; and Mesplet's press was not ready for business until the Commissioners and the Army had retired southward with some precipitation. The father of French-Canadian journalism passed the latter part of June and the first part of July in jail as an American sympathizer, a true portent of his future and that of many French-Canadian editors for half a century.³² General Thomas' retreat from Quebec to Deschambault has been described, with justice tinged with a touch of malice, as a "wild chase."³³ The American army of amateur soldiers, who had a healthy respect for British regulars, was rotten with smallpox, lacked both provisions and credit, and was dwindling away from the desertion of men who had volunteered for a quick and easy conquest which had not eventuated after nine months' hard service. The Americans evacuated Sorel on June 14, 1776; Montreal on June 15; Chambly on June 17, and St. Johns on June 18, retiring to Ticonderoga with 150 *congressistes* of Hazen's and Livingston's commands, who constituted the second notable exodus of French Canadians to the United States, the first being the Acadians in 1755.

The enforcement of the Militia Laws of 1777 has been termed by the historian of the Canadian Army the basis of the later dislike of the French Canadians for compulsory military service.³⁴ In 1778 Carlton was only able to raise three hundred militiamen for Burgoyne's invasion force. He realized "how unwilling they were to engage in the affair."³⁵ Burgoyne's defeat at Saratoga raised once more the spectre of American invasion; and significantly enough, the articles of capitulation permitted Canadian prisoners to return home, simply on their promise not to serve again. Congress

³⁰C. Carroll, *Journal during his Visit to Canada in 1776* (Baltimore, 1845).

³¹S. Marion, *Les Lettres canadiennes d'autrefois*, II (Ottawa, 1940), 12-4.

³²R. W. McLachlan, "Fleury Mesplet, the First Printer of Montreal" (*Transactions of Royal Society of Canada*, XII, 1906, sect. 2, 197-309).

³³Burt, *Old Province*, 233.

³⁴Stacey, *Canada and the British Army*, 9.

³⁵Public Archives of Canada, Series Q, 13, Carleton to Burgoyne, May 29, 1777, 222; cited Lanctôt, 117.

had not yet despaired of the "Fourteenth Colony"; for the Articles of Confederation of 1777 stipulated that Canada could "be admitted into and entitled to all the advantages of this union."³⁶ With the French alliance of February 1778, a plan of invasion under Lafayette was bruited; and the project was not dropped until the close of hostilities in the summer of 1782. After 1779, however, invasion was more of a French than an American cause in Canadian eyes. Admiral D'Estaing's manifesto to his "compatriotes de l'Amérique Septentrionale" was aimed at this sentiment: "Vous êtes nés Français; vous n'avez pu cesser de l'être."³⁷ Canada profited by division among her enemies, for first Washington opposed an enterprise which might restore Canada to a France whose ally Spain controlled Louisiana; then France had no desire to see the United States become self-sufficient and all-powerful on the continent.³⁸

I have dwelt so long upon this topic because the older French-Canadian historians³⁹ have made so much of how their people leaped to arms under the flag of their new rulers; while a modern writer has judged that "aucun événement n'a peut-être, directement ou indirectement, exercé autant d'influence sur le Québec que la révolution américaine."⁴⁰ The Revolution settled the fate of French feudalism and absolutism. It caused a split between the *élite* and the masses which had important results. It was a potent lesson in political rights; and from this period onward, democracy and liberty were forces in the French-Canadian mentality. One of the immediate aftermaths of the Revolution was the introduction into Quebec of seven thousand American Loyalists or Tories—Loyalist at least by profession, but undoubtedly the only loyalty of many was to good farm-land. Their number amounted to a tenth of the French Canadians; and their resourceful energy made them more of a force than their number indicates. Their coming cinched Wolfe's victory; Canada was not to be French, but French and British. It also caused the virtual repeal of the Quebec Act, the granting of the elements of representative government, and the division of British North America into Upper (English) and Lower (French) Canada in 1791. That terminology has long been dropped; but much bitterness in Quebec could have been avoided if the psychological attitudes appropriate to it had also disappeared. After the Treaty of Paris in 1783, American influence on French Canada became indirect; it had begun to shift from the political field to the economic, though the shift was not completed until Confederation.

Haldimand, Hamilton, and Holland agree in the verdict that after the Revolution the Canadians were "much tinged with Yankey politics," as Holland wrote to Roberts on November 9, 1785.⁴¹ Fox realized this fact in arguing, in support of the concessions of the Act of 1791, that "The inhabitants [of Canada] must feel that their situation is not inferior to that of their neighbors."⁴² American political influence was kept alive by the devious operations of Ira Allen, Ethan's wily brother, who in 1797 was captured by His Majesty's Navy in the English Channel, aboard a vessel

³⁶*Journals of Congress, 1777*, 924; cited Lanctôt, 117.

³⁷Smith, *Our Struggle*, II, 539.

³⁸McInnis, *The Unguarded Frontier*, 65-6.

³⁹Notably Garneau and Chapais.

⁴⁰Lanctôt, 121-2.

⁴¹PAC, C.O. 42, vol. 17, Holland to Roberts, Nov. 9, 1785; cited Lanctôt, 126.

⁴²*Parliamentary History of England*, 28, 1379; cited Lanctôt, 127.

inappropriately called the *Olive Branch*, which was laden with twenty thousand muskets destined for French-Canadian use in case Citoyen Genêt succeeded in his efforts to bring the French Revolution to Canada. The leadership of the "Frenchified"⁴³ Allens over the Green Mountain Boys had made Vermont a fertile field for Genêt's operations. But this *opéra comique* plotting stood no chance against the Canadian clergy's vigorous denunciations of the French Revolution. The remarkably rapid shift of French-Canadian opinion from a strong inclination toward France to full-hearted support of Great Britain was evidenced by celebrations in Quebec of Aboukir and Trafalgar, and even more notably by French-Canadian contributions to the British war chest.⁴⁴

Another American influence of a more lasting and sounder sort was the settlement after 1792 of the Eastern Townships, then a forest barrier between Quebec and New England, through which the first coach route connecting Boston and Quebec did not run until 1811. This pioneering was the work of American immigrants, invited by the British authorities when French and English alike refused to settle in this rich but wild region. The Americans played a major role in developing what has become one of the great agricultural and industrial regions of the province. The old tradition of border warfare gradually gave way to a new tradition of neighbourliness, evidenced in a Stanstead tavern in 1842, as the youthful Parkman reported with surprise, by the singing of "America" with the stanzas of the republican song and the addition to each of the refrain of "God Save the Queen."⁴⁵

The new economic relationship grew with the swelling of the Champlain-Richelieu trade, in which the exports of New England benefited by colonial preference until the Huskisson Laws of 1822 came into force. The American Embargo Act of 1807 could not stop this natural development; the subsequent contraband traffic amounted to more than the previous legal trade.⁴⁶ In 1811 the activities of American and French agents, trying to incite the French Canadians against Britain in an atmosphere of impending conflict, failed when Prevost's concessions ensured the latter's loyalty. For all the glorification by national-minded historians of the French-Canadian part in the War of 1812, most of that conflict was fought in Upper Canada. The nine thousand Americans in the Townships supplied six battalions to the British Army; but New England, which was opposed to the war and even threatened secession because of it, supplied two-thirds of that army's supplies.⁴⁷ Though Joseph Bouchette makes much of the "insatiable desire for gain"⁴⁸ of the Americans, it was the American South and West that forced the war, and their aim was a blow at Britain, not annexation of Canada. Jackson's "military promenade" turned into a seesaw struggle, of which the patriotic pride of Canadian and American historians has made too much. (It has also supplied us with two entirely different wars.) As

⁴³ *Allen's Narrative*, 49.

⁴⁴ PAC, Series Q, 83, Souscription volontaire, 152-5; cited Lanctôt, 129.

⁴⁵ Massachusetts Historical Society, Parkman Papers, Journal of 1842; quoted M. Wade, *Francis Parkman* (New York, 1942), 60.

⁴⁶ Lanctôt, 134.

⁴⁷ PAC, Series Q, 128-1, Prevost to Bathurst, Montreal, Aug. 27, 1814, 185-6; cited Lanctôt, 138.

⁴⁸ J. Bouchette, *A Topographical Description of the Province of Lower Canada* (London, 1815), 180.

far as Quebec was concerned, there were only two campaigns. In 1812 Dearborn advanced on Montreal from Plattsburg. He halted at the border when warlike enthusiasm waned among his followers, and returned to his base with his homesick army after an utterly bloodless four days' campaign. In 1813 Hampton actually advanced within fifteen miles of the St. Lawrence with four thousand men; but a night attack by eight hundred Canadians, including DeSalaberry's immortalized *Voltigeurs* (the first French-Canadian regulars), was sufficient to make him renounce the conquest of Canada. One wonders where Bouchette found the "depraved ferocity"⁴⁹ of which he accuses the American forces. The fact is that the eastern boundary was becoming stabilized; and the two adjoining populations had too much in common to make good enemies. From this period onward, the political struggle yielded almost entirely to the play of economic forces back and forth across the border.

French Canada and the United States had developed some close links. Immigration into the Townships, interrupted by the war, resumed apace, so that by 1821 the population there, almost entirely of American origin, was twenty thousand. More French Canadians were drifting south into Vermont and New York. The fur trade, largely taken over by Scots from the French in 1763,⁵⁰ was now divided between Canada and the United States, with John Jacob Astor involved simultaneously in a little land speculation with Sir John Johnson in the Townships, involving two million acres,⁵¹ and in breaking the monopoly of the North-Westerners on the Pacific Coast by the foundation of Astoria. The fur trade was now financed and directed by Anglo-Saxons, but it was manned by French Canadians; and the American West is dotted with the names of Chouteau, Cerré, Pratte, Cabanné, Dorion, Papin, and other less well known French trappers and traders. With the decline of the fur trade, the St. Louis French largely controlled the Western Division of Astor's American Fur Company, the greatest single organization of the trade in the American West. *Voyageurs* and *coureurs de bois* guided Lewis and Clark, Wilson Hunt, and many other American pioneers of the West. John Charles Frémont, the "Pathfinder" who was so fortunately married to the daughter of the expansionist Senator Thomas Hart Benton, was of French-Canadian stock; and when Francis Parkman went West in 1846 to study primitive Indian civilization, before setting about writing his history of *France and England in the New World*, his guide and friend was Henry Chatillon, his *engagé*, one Deslauriers.⁵² The old French-Canadian *coureur de bois* strain now began to flow into the channel of missionary effort, which swelled as trade passed into Anglo-Saxon hands; and the onetime rule of the Bishop of Quebec over the interior of North America was transformed into French missions under American sees. Illinois and Detroit now depended upon Baltimore rather than Quebec; but they were manned by missionaries of French blood, some of them priests who had found their presence in Canada unwel-

⁴⁹*Ibid.*, 613.

⁵⁰Wayne E. Stevens, "Organization of the British Fur Trade, 1760-1800," (*Missouri Valley Historical Review*, III, 1916-7, 186); cited by B. Brouillette in *Lancôt*, 147.

⁵¹Unpublished researches of A. J. H. Richardson in the Montreal Court House records.

⁵²M. Wade (ed.), *Francis Parkman's The Oregon Trail* (New York, 1943), intro.

come after active sympathizing with the Americans in 1775.⁵³ Oregon was set up as a diocese in 1846 under Bishop François-Norbert Blanchet, who with the Abbé Demers had been the first Catholic missionary in the region. On the other hand the Abbé Jean Holmes, who was of Vermont origin, was the greatest preacher of the 1840's in Quebec and the developer of the province's libraries, while his sister, Mère Ste-Croix, was Superior of the Quebec Ursulines.⁵⁴ With the years, the French contribution to the life of the Catholic Church in North America grew larger and larger, and in this unanticipated form the dream of the pioneers of New France was realized.

The Rebellion of 1837-8 once more brought American political influences to bear upon Canadian life, but these influences were working through both French- and English-Canadian popular leaders. Louis-Joseph Papineau was a great admirer of the American political system, but so was William Lyon Mackenzie whose *Sketches of Canada and the United States* (1833) was reprinted in a Richelieu paper, *L'Echo du Pays*, with the addition of extracts from Thomas Jefferson's writings for good measure.⁵⁵ Papineau, in his struggle for representative government, found that "Tous les loix, et tous les journeaux des plantations de la nouvelle Angleterre, devenaient les textes et les autorités qui expliquent notre demande."⁵⁶ As early as 1823, in a remarkable talk with Bathurst, the Colonial Secretary, he had maintained his admiration for American institutions and the ideas they represented, while Bathurst foresaw the development of Canada as an independent nation.⁵⁷ Papineau had hoped to achieve republican institutions for Canada within the British framework, but as the bitter struggle went on in the Assembly against arbitrary government and military rule, he inclined more and more toward annexation. This brought about his split with his great friend John Neilson, who considered such views as nothing short of high treason. The Ninety-Two Resolutions of 1834, which were Papineau's ideas formulated by Auguste-Norbert Morin and Elzéar Bédard, clearly show the influence of the American Bill of Rights; while the *Fils de Liberté* of Montreal and Quebec as clearly owe their origin to the Sons of Liberty of the American Revolution. Their goal was to "émanciper notre pays de toute autorité humaine, si ce n'était celle de la démocratie."⁵⁸ Holland's "tinge of Yankey politics" had become a permanent dye.

At St-Ours on May 7, 1837, Papineau pointed that "de l'autre côté de la ligne 45me étaient nos amis et nos alliés naturels."⁵⁹ The *Patriotes* hoped for American assistance, but such as was given was largely verbal. After 1827 the American press was generally sympathetic to the popular movement in Canada, with such influential magazines as the *North American Review* and the *Democratic Review* thus exercising the antipathy felt for Great Britain as a result of two wars and of the Maine, New

⁵³Brouillette in *Lancôt*, 174-6.

⁵⁴P.-J.-O. Chauveau, "L'Abbé Jean Holmes et ses conférences de Notre-Dame" (reprinted from *L'Opinion Publique*; Quebec, 1876).

⁵⁵J. Bruchesi in *Lancôt*, 189.

⁵⁶Archives of the Province of Quebec, Fonds Papineau, XI, 530, Papineau au Dr. Nancrède, 1838.

⁵⁷L.-J. Papineau, "Histoire de l'insurrection," in A.-D. DeCelles, *Papineau* (Montreal, 1905), 214-16.

⁵⁸Bruchesi in *Lancôt*, 193.

⁵⁹*Ibid.*, 194.

Hampshire, and Vermont boundary dispute, finally settled by the Ashburton Treaty in 1842. But Gosford, writing to Glenelg on May 25, 1837, testified that the American "better classes and the authorities"⁶⁰ disapproved of the Rebellion. Despite the sympathies of Maine, Vermont, and New York, which underwent the same agricultural economic crisis at this period as Lower and Upper Canada, a benevolent neutrality was the ruling attitude of the Americans towards the *Patriotes*. American egalitarian sympathies were easily enlisted for the struggle of the Canadian masses to achieve self-government in a conflict in which only the clergy, merchants, and *haute bourgeoisie* sided with the British government.⁶¹ The French Ambassador, M. de Pontbois, detected a certain extension of Manifest Destiny sentiment to Canada as well as to Texas and California,⁶² but this observation does not seem to have too solid a foundation. An American public which had long rejoiced in glorious reminiscences of the Revolution in Fourth of July addresses naturally felt a kinship for a Papineau who liked to cite the remark of an English parliamentarian: "Oui, si le même sang coulait dans les veines [des Canadiens] que celui qui a produit les Washington, les Franklin, les Jefferson, il vous chasseraient de leur pays comme vous avez été justement chassés des anciennes colonies."⁶³ But active American participation in the struggle in Lower Canada did not go much further than the action of the good ladies of Swanton, Vermont, who made a flag which was carried by Robert Shore Milnes Bouchette's ill-starred invasion of December 6, 1837. Papineau, Nelson, Brown, Dr. Côté, and Dr. O'Callaghan were hospitably received when they fled across the border after the collapse of the insurrection along the Richelieu in November 1837.⁶⁴ Some of the northern Vermont villages offered supplies to the exiles, as well as meeting halls, and served as bases for the fruitless border raids which Papineau disapproved of as idle "troublutions." But Papineau's own negotiations with New York politicians came to naught; and he retired to the more congenial company of Louis Blanc and the English Philosophical Radicals in Paris. The Hunter's Lodges (*Les Frères Chasseurs*) which were first organized in Vermont—then teeming with religious, philosophical, economic, and political radicalism—soon shifted their centre to the Middle West, where their success was much greater in enlisting American support—not that, however, of the best elements of society.⁶⁵ Van Buren protested to Lord Durham's son-in-law and envoy, Colonel Grey, when his government was accused of favouring the insurrection for its own purposes, that he judged the talk of annexation opposed to the best interests of the United States. This opinion was vigorously supported by Poinsett, the Secretary for War; and Charles

⁶⁰PAC, Rapports des années 1901 et 1902, Gosford to Glenelg, May 25, 1837; cited Bruchesi in Lanctôt, 200.

⁶¹C. D. Allin and G. M. Jones, *Annexation, Preferential Trade; and Reciprocity* (Toronto, 1911), 374-84.

⁶²R. de Roquebrune, "M. de Pontois et la rebellion des Canadiens français" (*Nova Francia*, April-Aug., 1928; III, no. 4, 238-49; no. 5, 273-8; no. 6, 362-71; cited Bruchesi in Lanctôt, 197-8.

⁶³Bruchesi in Lanctôt, 194.

⁶⁴N. Storey, "Papineau in Exile" (*Canadian Historical Review*, X, March, 1929, 43-52).

⁶⁵I. Caron, "Une Société secrète dans le Bas Canada en 1838; l'Association des Frères Chasseurs" (*Transactions of Royal Society of Canada*, 1926, series 3, XX, sect. 1, 17-34).

Buller, writing to John Stuart Mill on October 13, 1838, was able to say that one of Durham's achievements was that he "re-established peace and goodwill with the U.S., and rooted out from that people all sympathy with Canadian rebellion."⁶⁶

But even though Papineau's cause was lost, his influence was still felt in Canada, where the people, like the French people with regard to Napoleon, still felt that "il reparaitra à l'occasion."⁶⁷ His view of the United States was echoed by Alexis de Toqueville's *Democracy in America* (1840), a book which carried weight in Canada as relations with France grew closer once more. When Papineau returned from Paris in 1845, stuffed with the ideas of the French revolutionaries of 1848, he was supported by the *Rouges* and the new founded *Instituts Canadiens*, anti-clerical in tone and radical in politics, who felt that annexation to the United States was inevitable, considering how French Canada groaned under the unworkable union of 1840 and a prolonged economic depression. The exodus of French Canadians to the United States first took on notable proportions in this decade.⁶⁸

The seeming inevitability of annexation was equally evident to English Quebecers at this period, when the rise of a free-trade policy in England destroyed the protection under which they had long flourished. Lord Elgin, on his arrival in 1849, found annexation sentiment general among the commercial classes in Montreal.⁶⁹ The *Montreal Gazette* supported annexation on April 26, 1849, as an alternative to French domination in an empire which offered no preference to protect the colonial trade. The positions of the two races had evolved so much that Elgin considered the encouragement of French-Canadian nationalism as the best guarantee against annexation; and affirmed his belief that if the habitants' "religion, their customs, their habits, their prepossessions, their prejudices if you will," were respected, "who will venture to say that the last hand which waves the British flag on American ground may not be that of a French Canadian."⁷⁰ Elgin's opinion was soon born out by the annexation manifesto of October, 1849, with its bare sprinkling of French names among more than a thousand signatures. There was, however, a vigorous French-Canadian annexation society at Montreal led by A.-A. Dorion, which echoed the sentiments pronounced by Louis-Antoine Dessaulles before the *Institut Canadien*. More prosperous Quebec was less interested, though it had a similar society. Papineau called annexation the "Cause du progrès, de la civilisation, de la démocratie, et de la liberté," in a letter read at a 1849 meeting at St-Edouard-de-Huntington in the Townships;⁷¹ but Richard Cobden in England also saw the necessity of giving the Canadians "a liberty and an independence similar to that enjoyed by the United States."⁷² Despite sympathetic resolutions by the New York and Vermont legislatures, the United States was not really interested in the movement.

⁶⁶PAC, Charles Buller to J. S. Mill, Oct. 13, 1838.

⁶⁷Storey, "Papineau."

⁶⁸M. L. Hansen and J. B. Brebner, *The Mingling of the Canadian and American Peoples* (New Haven, 1940), 123-32.

⁶⁹Allin and Jones, *Annexation*, 22-3.

⁷⁰Sir A. G. Doughty (ed.), *Elgin-Grey Papers*, I (Ottawa, 1937), Elgin to Grey, May 4, 1848, 149-50.

⁷¹Bruchesi in *Lanctôt*, 219.

⁷²*Ibid.*, 221.

The *New York Herald* wrote that "No part of the Canadian population had a right to American sympathies, and less than all others, those who, disloyal in 1849, were ultra-loyal and the warmest partisans of the British Connection in 1837."⁷³

The annexation issue continued to be a feature of Canadian-American relations until 1866, when the repudiation of Elgin's Reciprocity Treaty of 1854 favoured the development of an east-west national economy rather than a north-south continental one. Meanwhile the *Rouges* under A.-A. Dorion, deeply influenced by the thought of Louis Blanc as interpreted by Papineau, had also lost the struggle against the *Bleus* under Cartier, who were backed with all the influence of the clergy.

The Civil War lessened the prestige of the United States in the French-Canadian mind, though at the outset Quebec favoured the North. A French version of *Uncle Tom's Cabin* circulated widely, and general sentiment was anti-slavery.⁷⁴ Many French Canadians joined the Northern army; some out of conviction; others under economic pressure took advantage of the high bounties paid for substitutes under the curious draft laws of the time. In 1861 the *Trent* affair caused a patriotic wave to sweep Canada, and "this feeling was not least in evidence in French Canada, where the Roman Catholic clergy were active in encouraging their parishioners to generous exertion."⁷⁵ The later raid on St. Albans, Vermont, by Southern agents operating from Quebec, and the freeing of the participants after their arrest upon their return to Canada, awoke a wave of resentment in the Northern press. The consequent war talk caused Henry Adams to write from London, where he was serving in the American Legation: "This Canadian business is suddenly found to be serious, and the prospect of Sherman marching down the St. Lawrence and Farragut sailing up it, doesn't just seem agreeable."⁷⁶ The irritation caused by this incident helped to kill annexationist sentiment and to further the plans of the Fathers of Confederation. The growing military power of the North and its new industrial strength were distrusted by many others besides George Etienne Cartier, who was convinced that democracy was not the ideal régime for the French Canadians, "monarchistes par la religion, par les coutumes, et les souvenirs du passé."⁷⁷ He brought about the support by French Canada of the project of Confederation; and with that great step in Canadian development, American political influence in Canada came to an end. It was definitely settled that the continent was to be divided between two powers, and not to be a political entity.

II

The nature of the relations of French Canada with the United States since Confederation might be summed up as fascinated admiration of American progress and prosperity—sometimes going as far as a revival of the annexationist sentiment of 1837-54 among isolated representatives of the *élite*—and distrust of the threat which that way of life implied to the

⁷³*Ibid.*, 221.

⁷⁴F. Landon, "Canadian Opinion of Southern Secession, 1860-1" (*Canadian Historical Review*, Sept., 1920, I, no. 3, 255-67).

⁷⁵Stacey, *Canada and the British Army*, 123.

⁷⁶W. Ford (ed.), *A Cycle of Adams Letters, 1861-65*, II, to C. F. Adams, Jr., Dec. 30, 1864, 238-9; cited Stacey, *Canada and the British Army*, 163-4.

⁷⁷Bruchesi in Lanctôt, 228.

survival of the French Canadians as a separate national group with a different culture in an overwhelmingly "Anglo-Saxon" North America.⁷⁸ A distinction should be made between the attitude of the clergy and *élite*, who generally opposed extension of American influence, and the enormous prestige of the United States with the masses. This attitude is well illustrated in Edouard Montpetit's survey of the subject.⁷⁹

Political annexationism in Quebec, which rested chiefly upon the hope of achieving fuller prosperity and fuller protection of its cherished rights under the American than the British system, died with the rise of Wilfrid Laurier and the Liberal party. Quebec became an undeniable power in the affairs of Canada, and could look to her own protection and prosperity. Commercial union, more appropriate to an age less interested in political than economic ambitions, was an English-Canadian idea, agitated in the 1880's in opposition to Sir John Macdonald's national economic policy by Goldwin Smith, that English eccentric who first developed the essentially American destiny of Canada⁸⁰ in his very brilliant writings and lectures from the heart of Tory Toronto, and by Erastus Wiman, a Canadian who had made a fortune in the United States. It was Wiman who inspired Honoré Mercier's discourse of 1893 in favour of annexation, which contained strange words to come from the mouth of the only French-Canadian politician since Confederation who achieved the uniting of his people—briefly—in a national or racial party, the very development which Elgin had dreaded as the end of Canada. Mercier pointed out that Quebec would benefit materially and spiritually by annexation, for prejudices of race and religion would be suppressed by immersion in the great American melting-pot.

It might be observed that whenever annexationism has cropped out in Canadian-American relations since 1837, it has been largely a rhetorical club used by English or French Canadians against the other racial group, whenever relations between the two races reached a crisis, or the economic position of either group became too uncomfortable. In the early difficult years after Confederation, Papineau and Hector Fabre used this club to strengthen the French-Canadian position.

Though the hope of re-establishing contact with the enormous group of French Canadians (350,000 by 1890) who left Canada for the United States in this period of vast industrial expansion in New England and depression in Quebec⁸¹ made an argument for the annexationists, this argument was rejected in Mgr. Fabre's *mandement* of February 15, 1891, on the grounds of the greater threat to "notre langue, notre nationalité, et par-dessus tout, notre sainte religion."⁸² The threat to *la survivance française* was the burden of the arguments of Joseph Tassé, Thomas Chapais, and L.-J. Desjardins against both annexation and commercial union. The election of Laurier to the prime ministership of Canada in 1896, and his holding of that office until 1911, eliminated annexationism from the French-Canadian mind. Henri Bourassa, a great Canadian nationalist as well as a great French-Canadian one, called the Quebeckers

⁷⁸E. de Nevers, *L'Ame Américaine* (Paris, 1900).

⁷⁹Edouard Montpetit, *Reflets d'Amérique* (Montreal, 1941).

⁸⁰Goldwin Smith, *Canada and the Canadian Question* (London, 1891).

⁸¹Allen R. Foley, "From French Canadian to Franco-American, 1650-1935" (unpublished dissertation, Harvard University, 1939).

⁸²*Mandements, lettres pastorales, circulaires et autres documents* (Montreal, 1893), 71-3; cited Lanctôt, 272.

the "staunchest and most constant opponents of annexation" early in the new century.⁸³ Despite the racial feeling bred by the anti-French Ontario school legislation of 1912 and the war-time friction between the races, Sir Lomer Gouin re-affirmed the French-Canadian faith in Confederation in 1919; and in the depths of the 1929 depression (which hit Quebec even harder than the United States) Premier Louis-Alexandre Taschereau of Quebec called annexationism suicidal for the French Canadians, maintaining his belief that a system which had not preserved Maine and Vermont from hard times could do no better for Quebec. Nevertheless, the 350,000 Franco-Americans of 1890 had grown to 750,000 by 1930.⁸⁴ The 1941 symposium of *L'Action Nationale* on the question of annexationism⁸⁵ (raised once more, presumably, by friction between the races in time of crisis) was summed up in the conclusion of André Laurendeau that "nous ne devons pas désirer l'annexion" and that "nous vivrons, si nous sommes de vivants," although annexation in the minds of the contributors to the *enquête* involved a choice between "la mort par immersion et la mort par inanition. De toutes manières, c'en est fini de la prépondérance française sur les rives du Saint-Laurent."⁸⁶ Today English- and French-Canadian nationalists alike join in stressing the importance of the cultivation of close Canadian relations—cultural, economic, and diplomatic—with the Latin-American nations against the continental dominance of the United States. When a Colonel McCormick blithely suggests, on paper supplied by Quebec, that Canada become the forty-ninth state, the French-Canadian press rejects the suggestion with considerable vigour; and the eighty-eight-year-old Albert Bushnell Hart's suggestion of post-war annexation was summarily dismissed by *Le Devoir* in February 1943, with the comment that the French-Canadian ideal was "to live in a free country on a friendly basis with Great Britain and France, closely co-operating with the United States in the defense of North America and its natural resources."⁸⁷ It remains true, however, that the thought of annexation still lingers in the back of the Canadian mind as a possibility, while it has long been dismissed from the American consciousness.

The chief reason for this survival is the simple fact that 3,500,000 French Canadians live in close proximity to 140,000,000 Americans. They feel the economic and cultural power of the United States perhaps more strongly than other sections of Canada, which are less conscious of the foreignness of American influence.⁸⁸ The ten American businesses that established branch plants in Quebec in 1879, to avoid Macdonald's protectionist tariff, had grown by 1887 to twenty-five. The geographical economy was too powerful to yield to a political economy. The peak of this economic penetration of Quebec by the United States was reached in 1934, when there were 394 American businesses operating in Quebec, and one-third of Quebec's industrial capital of three billions was American.

American unions entered Canada long after American capital. Although trade unions were introduced by English immigrants in 1827 in Quebec,

⁸³H. Bourassa, *The Spectre of Annexation* (Montreal, 1911), 10-11; cited Lanctôt, 274.

⁸⁴Foley, "From French Canadian to Franco-American."

⁸⁵"L'Annexionisme" (*L'Action Nationale*, XVIII, no. 6, June 1941).

⁸⁶*Ibid.*, 534-6.

⁸⁷*Le Devoir*, Feb., 1943.

⁸⁸Cf. H. F. Angus, *Canada and Her Great Neighbor* (Toronto, 1938).

they were declared illegal by the state and were opposed by both public and employers. Not until 1865, with the foundation of the first branch of an American union, the Typographers, did the problem which is now of considerable concern to Quebec start to arise. The shoemakers organized in 1870, and in the following year the outlawing of unions was abolished. In 1880 the Knights of Labor brought a wave of union organization upon Quebec; and in 1885 Mgr. Taschereau urged Catholic workers to break with this group. In the following year the Knights, after modifications of their constitution, were cleared by the American hierarchy; and by 1890 they had forty branches in Canada with 16,000 members. The American Federation of Labor succeeded in supplanting the Knights during the following decade. In 1902 Quebec workers, for the most part, affiliated themselves with the A.F. of L. groups which in 1908 formed the Canadian Federation of Labour, and in 1901 the first Catholic syndicate was founded in the shoe industry at Quebec. Strongly backed by the Church and by the provincial government, the French and Catholic syndicate movement grew as labour organization grew, but did not supplant the international unions, which had greater strength in bargaining with businesses which were largely national or international, rather than provincial, in character. The struggle between the syndicates and the internationals has been resumed with new vigour and bitterness since wartime industrialization has swollen the working classes of Quebec. The best recent treatment of this stormy question is by a Franco-American Catholic sociologist, Dr. Percy A. Robert, who discusses the possibility of "A Pact for Canadian Labor?"⁸⁹

Ever since Confederation, the Quebec government has consistently encouraged the entry of American capital into the province. Not until 1901 was the first opposition to this process heard from Errol Bouchette, whose cry of "Emparons-nous de l'industrie" has since been echoed with increasing vigour by a French-Canadian nationalism which only became economically minded after 1920. The current denunciations of foreign capital, trusts, and unions in *Relations* and *L'Action Nationale*⁹⁰ are symptomatic of the gradual adoption of the economic point of view by the *élite* of a most politically-minded people. Perhaps the best comment on this long process of economic penetration is that written in 1928 by the leading French-Canadian banker, M. Beaudry Leman; "La menace la plus sérieuse n'est pas celle qui pénètre sous forme de capital argent, mais celle qui est représentée par le capital moral et intellectuel d'hommes mieux préparés que nous à tirer parti des richesses naturelles."⁹¹ Quebec has acted on this view by establishing the Ecole des Hautes Etudes Commerciales and a wide range of other trade, technical, and commercial schools throughout the province, and by supporting the agricultural and fisheries schools affiliated with the French universities of Montreal and Quebec. These universities have also adapted their scientific faculties so that more emphasis is placed on application of theoretical knowledge than formerly, and so that the standards of a long-neglected field of knowledge have been

⁸⁹*The Canadian Register* (Montreal), October 2, 1943.

⁹⁰*Relations*, Montreal monthly published by the Jesuits of the Ecole Sociale Populaire, since 1940. *L'Action Nationale*, Montreal nationalist monthly published since 1933. Successor of *L'Action (canadienne-) française* (1917-28).

⁹¹Beaudry Leman, "Les Canadiens-Français et le milieu américain" (*La Revue trimestrielle*, Sept. 1928, 273-5; cited Lanctôt, 285).

raised to the European and American levels. Some far-sighted American companies have displayed a willingness to acquire as much French-Canadian technical and administrative personnel as can be obtained, an attitude which has taken some of the force from the nationalist attack on "foreign exploitation of our natural resources." The more moderate groups recognize the contribution that America has made to the development of Quebec's economic structure.

Opposition to American influence in the cultural domain is much deeper. Before turning to this thorny topic, it might be well to mention in passing that M. Bourassa's charge that the *maudit Yankey* is responsible for such evils as exist in Quebec's political system hardly holds water, for much the same customs may be found in France and in England, and Quebec takes politics a good deal harder than the United States has taken them since the early days of the last century. On the other hand, M. Bourassa's dictum that the Monroe doctrine is a Canadian policy, and the best defence of the country, was borne out by the French-Canadian members of the House of Commons in commenting on President Roosevelt's 1936 declaration that the United States stood ready to defend its neighbours, and by subsequent events, including the growing sentiment for Canadian membership in the Pan-American Union.

Culturally French Canada and the United States are connected to a degree somewhat better appreciated south of the border than in Quebec. Quebec contents itself with maintaining loose cultural connections with the two-fifths of its blood which can be found in the United States, concentrated chiefly in New England, where once Yankee cities of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New Hampshire, and Maine are now definitely Franco-American. But interest among these people in Quebec is not as strong as Quebec's interest in them, with the exception of some of the Franco-American *élite*, who complain about lack of attention from the province.⁹² This group as a whole, however, has been a powerful tie between Canada and the United States, with its participation in both cultures; and it is to be hoped that the keen interest in French Canada on the part of Americans in the last two decades may be echoed by a fuller appreciation of the United States by the French Canadians, whose determination to preserve their way of life against unconscious assaults by a more powerful civilization sometimes blinds them to the better points of that culture. It is unfortunately true that the worst elements of a culture are those which spread most easily abroad. For instance, the picture of the American civilization which emerges from *La Revue Dominicaine's* inquest on *Notre Américanisation*⁹³ has a nightmare quality to the American who does not know French Canada at first hand. After fourteen months of Quebec life, its observations and conclusions seem to me less fantastic than they did at first. So-called American influences, which might perhaps better be labelled the effects of industrialization—which is a world-wide process of our time—have produced a serious dislocation of the traditional Quebec social structure, which has not yet evolved a substitute for the old patriarchal rural order. Everett Hughes' *French Canada in Transition*⁹⁴ is an admirable study of this process, and little can be added here to his observations. The

⁹²Benoît, *L'Ame franco-américaine*.

⁹³*Notre Américanisation*, enquête de *La Revue Dominicaine* (Montreal, 1937).

⁹⁴Everett C. Hughes, *French Canada in Transition* (Chicago, 1943).

influence in this process of Americanization of the tourist, of whom Professor Benjamin Silliman in 1819 might be said to be the pioneer—with his observation that “Quebec, at least for an American, is certainly a very peculiar place”⁹⁵—was already important in the 1850’s, when Thoreau visited Quebec with 1,500 fellow travellers and remarked—with the now traditional irreverence—that what he got by going to Canada was a cold. He also was appalled by the amount of spruce wax which the Montrealers chewed.⁹⁶ The influence of the American tourist subsequently became stronger and stronger; and the floodgates opened in 1928 with the coming of two million tourists a year. It is not generally recognized in the United States or Canada that this American tourist movement is paralleled to some extent by the movement of Quebecers to New England in the summer, and to Boston, New York, and Florida, in the winter.

Sports have also done much to unify the continent. After 1890 baseball supplanted the national sport of Canada, lacrosse, which now seems chiefly to be played in the United States. Bowling has taken the place of the snowshoe clubs of old, while hockey and skiing are common North American madneses. The French-Canadian press has adapted itself more and more to the American pattern, though a few notable journals of opinion hold out against the tide and recall to the American observer the days of vigorous personal journalism, recorded in Mark Twain’s “The Spirit of the Tennessee Press.” With Latin verve the French Canadian of Montreal has fallen upon the tabloid, which was brought to its most lurid development in the *New York Daily Graphic* by a Franco-American, Emile Gauvreau. The press services operate on a continental basis which has its effect on the development of a common continental opinion, although in today’s war news the Canadians always spearhead the advances in the Canadian press, while the Americans always seem to be carrying the burden of the war in the American papers. More and more French magazines are adopting an American *format*, while the American magazines which circulate most widely in Quebec are the cheapest and most lurid, not the so-called “quality group” magazines. The American theatre drove out the French theatre in Montreal before the development of sound movies in 1929 aggravated a problem already grave since 1910, when American films with French legends thrust the American mentality upon Quebec. It is the sensational Hollywood films which have the greatest appeal to Quebec, while the more serious artistic efforts are rejected by those who mourn the war-time absence of French pictures characterized by an *esprit français*. The radio, which supplanted the phonograph in popular appeal about 1930, largely operates as an Anglo-American influence, though the French programmes originating in Quebec are followed with interest in New England. Here again the cultural truism operates: what penetrates most widely in Quebec is the manufactured humour and music of the mass-consumption programmes, while few listeners follow the wealth of symphonic and operatic music and the educational programmes offered by the American stations. French Canada’s Radio-Collège, however, is probably more influential than any similar American effort. American advertising has laid its resourceful and often unpleasant hand upon Quebec, with an undoubted

⁹⁵Benjamin Silliman, *A Tour to Quebec in the Autumn of 1819* (London, 1822), 110.

⁹⁶Henry David Thoreau, *A Yankee in Canada* (Boston, 1866), 1, 17.

Americanizing effect on the French-Canadian mentality. But these influences are continental, and French Canada has resisted them better than English Canada. A reaction, calling for the re-Frenchifying of Quebec, has begun in recent years, to the vast approval of Americans who like the sense of foreignness they get in coming to Quebec and the escape from the sometimes appalling sameness of American civilization.

From literature, which is perhaps the best index to the cultural history of a people, certain suggestive conclusions may be drawn. There are more American connections with French-Canadian literature than nationalist teaching indicates. Philippe de Sales La Terrière's highly entertaining *Mémoires* are a record of American influence in the period between the American Revolution and the Papineau Rebellion. Garneau, whose life-work was inspired by an echo of Lord Durham's remark that the French Canadians were a people without a history or a literature, was the first historian of New France to relate its history to that of the United States. He attached more importance to the American influence than many later historians, whose years of study in Paris have made them more French than Canadian. The Abbé Casgrain, who continued Garneau's work and who certainly was French-Canadian in his outlook, was the great friend and collaborator of Francis Parkman, who brought French-Canadian history to the notice of the English-speaking world. The injustice of some French-Canadian attacks on American culture is evidenced by what befell Parkman, who played an unquestioned role in immortalizing for the English-speaking world the rich and colourful history of New France. If Parkman did not comprehend "the glorious destiny of the French-Canadian people," as the zealot journalist Jules-Paul Tardivel bitterly complained in launching a savage attack on the historian in 1878,⁹⁷ it was not for lack of knowledge or of authoritative advice. Parkman was in close and friendly correspondence with Garneau, G.-B. Faribault, the Abbé Faillon, D.-B. Viger, Père Félix Martin, Papineau, the Abbé Laverdière, Pierre Chauveau, Dr. Hubert La Rue, J.-C. Taché, Antoine Gérin-Lajoie, J.-G. Barthe, Louis P. Turcotte, Arthur Buies, Faucher de St. Maurice, the Abbé Bois, N.-E. Dionne, Edmund Lareau, and Joseph Marmette. He even relieved the misery of Octave Crémazie, the first national poet, by employing him for copying work in Paris.⁹⁸ But the name of Parkman is still sullied in the minds of French Canadians who have never read him, but vaguely recall the mud-slinging of an intransigent newspaperman who was more Catholic than the Seminary of Quebec and more French Canadian than the Abbé Casgrain. It is amusing to note that Tardivel's mother was an American; that he was brought up in the United States; and that even after he became the self-constituted pillar of Quebec journalism, he could not write correct French, as Pierre-Georges Roy's comments in the Quebec Archives' copy of *L'Anglicisme; voilà l'ennemi!* bear witness.⁹⁹

Much of the French-Canadian opposition to American cultural influences is based upon an emotional conviction, similar to Tardivel's, that a materialistic America can never understand a spiritual-minded French Canada. This theory, reinforced by various carefully built Chinese Walls, ignores a number of facts. Pamphile Lemay was inspired by Longfellow, whose *Evangeline* he translated, to write his greatest work, *Les Vengeances*.

⁹⁷J.-P. Tardivel, *Mélanges*, première série, I (Montreal, 1887), 337-51.

⁹⁸Massachusetts Historical Society, Parkman Papers.

⁹⁹J.-P. Tardivel, *L'Anglicisme: voilà l'ennemi!* (Quebec, 1880).

Olivar Asselin, the greatest French-Canadian journalist, served an apprenticeship of seven years on Franco-American papers; and for all his conscious opposition to American cultural influences, was deeply impregnated by them. The best critic of French-Canadian literature, Louis Dantin, is a Franco-American, as is one of French Canada's finest poets, Rosaire Dion-Levèsque, who has been deeply influenced by the extremely American Walt Whitman. Paul Morin's exotic verse runs parallel to much American and English verse of the same period. The novels and plays of Robert Choquette, Jean-Charles Harvey, and Harry Bernard show strong American influences. In fact the whole great *terroir* movement is a French-Canadian counterpart of the regionalism which has developed so widely in American literature of this century. But all these facts and many others are commonly ignored by the asserters of the uniqueness of French-Canadian civilization. The difficulty is that a cherished and carefully nurtured theory does not recognize the existence of certain inescapable geographical and historical facts. The French Canadians and the other North Americans have lived for more than three centuries upon a common continent; they have been shaped by the same geographic and climatic forces; through the years they have acted and reacted upon one another, so that each carries some mark of the other; and each is recognized as foreign by Europeans. In short, they are different sorts of the American whom Whitman hymned in his *Song of Myself*, so magnificently translated by Dion-Levèsque:

Faisant partie de la Grande Nation des Nations dont la plus infime est
autant que la plus grande;

Habitant du Midi aussi bien que du Nord; je vis sur les plantations;
Yanki, je fais mon chemin, prêt au commerce, avec des membres qui
sont les plus souples qui soient sur terre, et les plus résistants aussi;
Kentuckien, je traverse la vallée de l'Elkhorn, avec mes jambières en
peau de daim;

Je suis un Louisianais ou un Georgien;

Je suis un batelier sur les lacs et dans les baies ou le long des côtes;
je suis natif de l'Indiana, du Wisconsin, de l'Ohio;

Je suis à mon aise sur mes raquettes dans les solitudes neigeuses du
Canada; à mon aise dans la brousse, ou avec les pêcheurs sur les
côtes de Terre-Neuve;

A mon aise parmi la flotte des brise-glaces, allant avec les autres et
louvoyant;

A mon aise dans les montagnes du Vermont, ou dans les forêts du
Maine, ou sur un ranch du Texas;

Camarade des Californiens, camarade des libres gars du Nord-Ouest
(aimant leurs vastes carrures);

Camarade des raftsmen et des charbonniers; camarade de tous ceux
qui échangent des poignées de mains et vous invitent à boire et à
manger;

Ecolier auprès des simples; maître parmi les penseurs; novice à ses
débutants et qui pourtant possède l'expérience d'innombrables saisons;

Je suis un fermier, un mécanicien, un artiste, un homme du monde,
un marin, un quaker,

Un prisonnier, un aventurier, un voyou, un avocat, un médecin, un
prêtre.

Je résiste à tout mieux qu'à ma propre diversité.¹⁰⁰

¹⁰⁰Rosaire Dion-Lévésque, *Walt Whitman* (Montreal, 1933), 60-2.

DISCUSSION

Professor Brouillette stated that he preferred the opinions of outsiders such as Hughes, Miner, Siegfried, and Wade rather than those of French Canadians on such matters as were discussed in this paper. He declared, however, that it was hard to know just what an "American influence" was. More systematic surveys of social and cultural life were needed. Casual observations were not satisfactory even though sympathetic. He said that the settlers of the Eastern Townships were mostly Irish or plain Englishmen rather than Americans, to which *Mr. Wade* replied that Americans had to profess loyalism at time of entry. *Professor Brouillette* objected to the citing of the founding of the *Ecole des hautes études commerciales* as an example of American influence; he said it was founded to meet the needs of the time.

Major Lanctot commended *Mr. Wade* upon his broad and sympathetic paper, but felt that he had used French-Canadian material too exclusively. *Major Lanctot* would have liked *Mr. Wade* to evaluate the American reaction to the French Canadians. He pointed out the favourable seaboard position of the American colonies, their short lines of communication, and the English alliance with the Iroquois which gave them strength in the fur trade. The French had too many missionaries and not enough settlers. This may have saved many dusky Indians for the other world but it lost Canada for the French.

He said that the seigneurs were not the leaders of the French-Canadian militia. A seigneur might even have to serve under his own "habitant." He cited Bishop Briand's remark that the French Canadians who served in the American forces were "scum of the country," and pointed out that *Mr. Wade* does not mention the strong French-Canadian help which was the decisive factor which turned the scale in favour of Great Britain. Also during the British war against revolutionary France, the French-Canadian clergy and citizens actually gave money to the British cause, not merely talk. This shows the real extent of their patriotism and feeling. Only after 1783 did the English and Scots, who had greater financial resources, take over the fur trade.

Mr. Wade's paper he felt to be too analytical and not drawn together in conclusion. The real secret of French-Canadian policy was to be found in the determination to safeguard their culture. In this respect the French Canadians would probably choose preservation of their language in competition with their faith should they be forced to choose between them.

He affirmed that the only real American political influence upon French Canada was to be found at the time of the American Revolution. The American propaganda campaign at that time was admirably carried out so that even remote villages were talking about liberty, the rights of man, etc., after that campaign. The merchants helped this campaign as, at that time, they could all speak French. The French Canadians admire American business technique and methods, and are trying to regain ground lost during the time when classical education dominated. The similarities of social and cultural life are not so much the result of American influence as a reflection of the way of life which is common to all North America. He cited attitudes toward marriage and divorce, and birth-control as examples of French-Canadian rejection of American influence. He said French

Canadians want to be free to choose from amongst "American goods," as some are good and others are of a "different quality." Finally, he insisted upon the determination of the French Canadians "to survive."

M. Nadeau congratulated Mr. Wade on the extent and thoroughness of his work. He asked him to define American civilization in a few words in order to make clear what can be called American influence in Quebec. He said we have missed the fact that Lafontaine played a large part in helping French Canadians to adjust themselves to constitutional development, and that in this process Lafontaine was deeply influenced by the American Bill of Rights. He advised further study of this point. He suggested we must distinguish between the country and the city in the study of American influences. He proposed that French Canadians go to the United States and make similar studies there of American culture.

Professor Adair pointed out that the Eastern Townships were almost entirely an extension of the United States. He based his statements upon careful census studies made by one of his students. These settlers were Irish in name only. They came from the United States and had little to do with the United Kingdom. They were often brought in as contract labour, or they crossed the line without permission. This movement of people was not really a Loyalist move but a northward thrust of population comparable to the push to the west.

Professor Rothney stated that the southern section of the Eastern Townships had originally been settled mainly by Americans who came to get good land, but that in the northern section especially, many settlers were brought in directly from the British Isles. French Canadians came later but had penetrated throughout the area by 1850. He suggested that if Papineau were ever cheered in the Eastern Townships, it must have been near the United States border. The only electoral victory ever obtained by the Annexationist Party was in the County of Sherbrooke, then much larger than it is today, and their votes came mainly from the southern part of the district. He would like to hear the influence of Franco-Americans who return to Canada discussed. He cited the comparative frequency of their appearance in proportion to other French Canadians in movements such as the C.C.F. as an example. He said pro-Pan-American feeling in French Canada was more pro-Latin America than pro-United States. Most French-Canadian nationalists strongly favour Pan-Americanism.

Professor Sage indicated that Mr. Wade was in error in saying that Astor broke into a Hudson's Bay Company monopoly on the Pacific coast as the Hudson's Bay Company was not there when he arrived.

Mr. Wade replied to the several comments that he was aware of having neglected Iroquois culture but that this was necessary because of lack of space. He believed the Albany traders to have been largely Scots who came to Montreal and took over the administration of the fur trade, including that of the West. *Major Lanctot* suggested that Mr. Wade examine the contracts of the period. *Mr. Wade* went on to say that Canadian-American civilization cannot be defined in so short a time but that roughly it means a common continental state of mind, a way of life dominant in English-speaking America, of which industrialization and urban life are predominant characteristics. The main problems of French Canada today are the results of the extension of industrialization and urbanization to that area. The

urban population in French Canada is now 60 to 65 per cent and growing fast. He thought M. Nadeau's suggestion for French Canadians to study French-Canadian influence in the United States a good one, and cited two examples of this actually occurring, financed by the Guggenheim and Rockefeller Foundations.

He stated that the Eastern Townships were certainly not all settled by Tory Americans—the desire for land, intensified by the occupation of most of the good land in New England, was the real reason for the coming of most settlers. Many St. Francis Indians went to Dartmouth College which was founded as an Indian missionary institution. A “branch” of the college was even established on the St. Francis Reserve.

THE DISCUSSION OF THE PROBLEM OF PUBLIC AND HISTORICAL RECORDS IN CANADA

By the ARCHIVES COMMITTEE

THE afternoon session on Thursday, June 1, was devoted entirely to a discussion of the problem of public archives in Canada. This discussion was based upon an article written by Professor George W. Brown, which appeared in the number of March, 1944, of the *Canadian Historical Review*, and which is entitled, "The Problem of Public and Historical Records in Canada."

In opening the discussion, Professor Brown stated that the present situation with respect to the preservation and use of historical records and like material is most regrettable. First of all we must get a comprehensive idea of the present situation; then we must find some way of providing a stimulus to further development and constructive action. In pursuance of the initial objective the meeting was presented with a series of reports upon the present condition of federal and provincial archives. Great stress was laid in the discussion upon the importance of distinguishing between Public Records and other historical or archival materials, and the serious results of the failure of governments to look after their own Public Records were emphasized.

Major Gustave Lanctot, Dominion Archivist, pointed out that the Public Archives of Canada are still governed by the Act of 1912 under which Public Records *may be* transferred to the Archives. However, after the present Archives Building was erected to receive these Public Records, only two or three departments ever sent any records. The policy of the Public Archives in collecting and displaying such material as historical pictures, medals, etc., had aroused some criticism, and tended to create an impression that Public Records were not the primary concern of the Archives. The great increase of departmental records after the last war created a difficulty with the result that a new building, having no connection with the Public Archives, was put up in 1937 and departments which wished to store records there were given space to do so. This means, in general, that Public Records antedating 1867 are deposited at the Public Archives; those for the later period are in some cases placed in the Storage Record Building which, as its name implies, is no more than a storage place. Consultation of the records in this Storage Record Building is very difficult, the materials held there not being properly classified. At present this building has been taken over for war purposes.

Since the outbreak of war, Major Lanctot has proposed the creation of a War and Public Archives Commission whose prime aim would be the proper classification of Public Records. This proposal has not been implemented. Hence the Public Archives has limited its work during the last four years to classifying the records it now holds, and to completing the calendaring already begun. This work is well advanced.

As a post-war programme, Major Lanctot proposed that the Public Archives make a survey of all public and private archives in Canada for the purpose of constructing a substantial catalogue of such materials which

would make them easily available for general use. A start on this plan is being made with the Archives of the Séminaire de Québec. The findings would be published at government expense, and would constitute one part of the government's rehabilitation programme.

For British Columbia, the Librarian of the University of British Columbia, Dr. Kaye Lamb, made the report. He stated that this province has had an archives since 1908. Although there is no provincial Archives Act, the department is now well established on a sound basis. It is housed in the Provincial Library, with which it is closely interrelated. It contains a very valuable collection of historical materials in good condition, but cannot be regarded at present as a full-fledged Public Record office, as there are no regulations in effect requiring the government departments to forward their non-current files to the Archives. Some departments have transferred their records with some regularity, others have not. One department has destroyed almost everything. At present, destruction of Public Records is permitted only with the approval of the Printing Committee of the Legislature, the meetings of which the Provincial Librarian is privileged to attend. This checks wholesale destruction, but the arrangement is not entirely satisfactory, and it is hoped that legislation to modify it will be passed.

With regard to Alberta, Professor M. H. Long of the University of Alberta pointed out that, after a period of neglect of historical records, with consequent irreparable losses, there has been some awakening to their value, and it is possible that steps may now be taken for their collection, organization, and preservation. The most important collection of historical material is at present that of the Legislative Library which contains standard sets of printed Public Records; a very respectable collection of Canadiana dealing largely with the West and the North; a good many newspaper files, often incomplete; and the beginnings of pamphlet and manuscript collections. There is no provincial Hansard, the records of debates in the legislature being preserved only in the form of clippings from leading newspapers which are dated, pasted into scrapbooks, and indexed. There has been a good deal of confusion, lack of proper space and care in the treatment of the various materials but under the present Librarian, Mrs. Gostick, the situation has shown improvement. At least foundations exist upon which to build. Nuclei of a provincial museum exist, and such an institution would have been established had the outbreak of war not prevented it. The provincial government has been confronted increasingly with the problem of inactive departmental files and has recently appointed a committee under the chairmanship of Dr. Robert Newton, President of the University, to study and report upon the best methods of "recording, preserving and handling public documents, records of historical value to the Province, and allied matters relating thereto." It is hoped that the activities of this committee will lead in due course to the establishment of a Public Records Office and Archives for the province.

For Saskatchewan Professor G. W. Simpson of the University of Saskatchewan gave a report on the Public Records of that province prepared by Professor A. S. Morton, Provincial Archivist. Professor Morton declared that whereas in the past Saskatchewan had been very careless of

its Public Records, at present a satisfactory policy for such records had been initiated. The peculiarity of the problem in this province was that the Public Records were in Regina, while the ability and willingness to care for them were in the University at Saskatoon. The government decided, largely through the efforts of the Hon. J. W. Estey, then Minister of Education and Attorney-General, to solve the problem by creating a subdivision of the Archives under the shadow of the University where the organization, the study, and the use of the documents would be more intense and permanent. It was decided to follow the practice of the British government and to draw a sharp distinction between Public Records, i.e., authentic documents never out of possession of the government, and historical documents which have been in the possession of private individuals and which perhaps have passed from hand to hand. In keeping with this practice, "The Historical Public Records Office of the Province of Saskatchewan" receives only documents which have never left the possession of the government. It leaves other historical material to be acquired and preserved by libraries, including the Library of Parliament, the Library of the University, and historical societies.

Professor Morton insists that the chief task in the organization of a Public Records Office is the preparation of requisite calendars and indexes. These are practically complete for the whole material of Territorial times. The calendars of the material of the North-West Territorial government extend to 2000 pages typed single-space. By arrangement with the Committee on Public Records in Regina a duplicate copy of the calendars and indexes is deposited in the Library of Parliament within reach of government departments for consultation and to enable them to make enquiries of the Public Records Office. It was decided to include the manuscript Minutes of the Councils and Legislatures and of the Orders-in-Council as Public Records since by so doing the relations subsisting between them and the *Sessional Papers* and the correspondence of the government would be revealed. It was also decided to have the correspondence between the Territorial government and the Dominion authorities copied. This has been done. Finally, it was decided to receive the archives of corporations functioning under acts of provincial legislature to save them from destruction, always provided that their authenticity remained unimpaired, that is that they came directly from the corporations themselves or from their legal representatives. Very valuable materials of this kind, which are kept separate from the Public Records proper, have already been acquired.

A report upon conditions in Manitoba, prepared by Mr. J. L. Johnston, Provincial Librarian, Winnipeg, was read by Professor W. L. Morton of the University of Manitoba. Mr. Johnston pointed out that Public Records in Manitoba have been subject to destruction by fire, pests, floods, and unsatisfactory policies on the part of some departmental officials. At present such records are scattered in buildings throughout Winnipeg and the province where they are subject to these and other changes. The continuation of this situation will ensure their destruction. In recent years the lack of records for official purposes has demonstrated the need to maintain unbroken the essential records of government and governmental policies and activities. A more satisfactory policy towards these matters is a definite possibility as soon as conditions are normal. A new building

is planned in which an area is included for the housing of records and files. The recent reorganization of the Manitoba Historical and Scientific Society in a modern form coincides with this planned development. At the time of the revision of the Legislative Library Act in 1940, provision for the establishment of a Division of Public Records and Archives was included. This provision is subject to enactment by proclamation.

The situation with regard to other historical and archival materials is somewhat similar to the story of Public Records. With the erection of a new building accommodation may become available for the consolidation of the historical material located in the Legislative Library which under the impetus of an active Historical Society will increase rapidly. The consolidation of the records and volumes of the Legislative Library and of the Historical Society in suitable rooms adjacent to the library, with maps and illustrative material included, is a hope for the immediate future.

Professor Fred Landon, Librarian of the University of Western Ontario, told of the regional collection of history at that university. Beginning with certain small collections of papers which were acquired by the library, the collection was greatly increased by the acquisition of large stores of records, first from the court house of Middlesex County and later from the court house of Huron County. These and other records are being organized, the idea being the building up of an archives of Western Ontario, illustrative of its social, economical, and political history. There is no attempt to go beyond the particular region lying west of a line drawn between Hamilton and Owen Sound. The collection is directed by Miss Elsie M. Murray and in order to extend its usefulness and also to stimulate interest in local history generally two mimeographed publications are issued. *Western Ontario Historical Notes*, issued quarterly, is now in its second volume. *Western Ontario History Nuggets*, is issued from time to time, each number containing either a document or an original piece of research. Four *Nuggets* have so far appeared.

Dr. J. J. Talman, Assistant Librarian of the University of Western Ontario, former Archivist of Ontario, stated that the Department of Public Records and Archives of Ontario has a name which would justify the collection of any kind of historical material but unfortunately the name is practically all that exists at the moment. During the early years of the century much material was collected by the late Colonel Fraser and that material is carefully preserved and is available for students. This consists of printed manuscript collections, for example those of John Strachan, John Beverley Robinson, A. N. Buell, etc.; newspapers of which there is a good collection; land records, which are true public records having been transferred officially from the Crown Lands Department to the Archives; maps; pamphlets; printed material such as old directories; and a few pictures. The manuscript material has been well calendared by Miss Helen McClung.

In 1923 the Bureau of Archives was made a department and an act was passed providing for the regular transfer to the Archives of obsolete government material and the destruction of useless records on the authority of the Archivist. In some cases the provisions of the act have been observed.

In 1934 more than half the Archives staff was dismissed and the department was able to do nothing except carry on. There is hope that a change for the better may be on the way.

No report upon the provincial Archives of the Province of Quebec was made as M. Antoine Roy found it impossible to be present.

Professor A. G. Bailey of the University of New Brunswick reported that there was at present no special office of archives in New Brunswick. He stated that for a very long period beginning before Confederation the Public Records of the province had been shamefully neglected, in support of which he cited specific facts and quoted from the late Dr. W. C. Milner's report to the Canadian Historical Association in 1929. He suggested the possibility that this state of affairs might be due to the absence of a sense of historic continuity, and speculated on the effect of Loyalist attitudes and those engendered by the timber trade in this regard. By contrast there had occurred within recent years what had been referred to as an historical renaissance in the Maritime Provinces, due to a considerable extent to the efforts of Dr. Webster and others, as a result of which conditions were much improved. He expressed the hope that, as a sequel to the present discussion, recommendations would go forward from the Canadian Historical Association to the various governments throughout the Dominion with a view to the establishment of Public Record Commissions and Archives where such organizations did not already exist.

Professor D. C. Harvey, the Archivist for Nova Scotia, reported that the province had early turned its attention to the care of records; in 1857 had appointed a Records Commission, and a Records Commissioner, who carried on until his death in 1891. From 1891 to 1929 the collection which he had made was not increased to any extent but was kept by the Curator of the Museum, who turned it over to the Public Archives which were established by statute in 1929. The Statute of 1929 provided for a non-political administration of the Archives by a Board of Trustees, and gave a wide definition of archives to include not only the public records proper which were in the possession of the government or had been vested in the government by previous legislation but also all materials public and private that might be regarded as of historical interest. Therefore, while the Public Records that might be of use to the government were to be preserved and made accessible, the other needs and the convenience of historical students were not neglected. Moreover, the government of Nova Scotia has provided and is prepared to provide generously for the upkeep and administration of the Archives Building and its contents. At present the policy of the Archives is to accept everything of historical value; but, in the arrangement and disposition of the various collections, to make a distinction between Public and Private Records, and to describe the pictures and muniments as an historical museum within the Archives building. The fact that this building is fireproof has perhaps led the Board to accept some material which might have been deposited elsewhere, although the convenience of historical investigators might have dictated the same policy.

The situation in Prince Edward Island was also briefly described. While there has been no well worked out policy, care has been taken to

preserve a good deal of material which is housed in the Provincial Building in Charlottetown.

It was the view of this meeting that, while there were some signs of improvement, the situation in general was a deplorable one, and that the Association should take whatever steps it could to draw this to the attention of public authorities and others who might assist in bringing about an improvement.

DISCUSSION

R. G. Trotter gave a short summary of the importance of microfilm to present historical research stating that microfilm as an aid to Archives and to private scholars is no longer in the experimental stage, as it was when its possibilities were discussed at the McGill meeting of this Association in 1933. Much experimental investigation by scholars as well as by technicians has now resulted in the development of a variety of apparatus and methods which are sufficiently standardized to warrant their adoption. For the time being, however, the demands of war for photographic equipment has made it unavailable for other purposes. As soon as the war is over, there will be plenty of equipment available and added experience of its possibilities. Archives and libraries will find microfilm invaluable for making copies of perishable materials and of materials whose bulk is disproportionate to their value. By its use they can also most easily obtain copies of material in private possession and can fill gaps in their own files such as newspapers.

It is important that any plans as to buildings and staffs should recognize the usefulness of such methods and make adequate provision for them.

It is important also that the making of microfilm copies of Archival material for scholars' use should not fall into commercial hands. It is desirable that Archives should provide facilities for scholars to use their own cameras as well as make it possible to purchase such copies at cost.

Representations to governments might well stress the utility and economy of such techniques and thus help to show that while Archives were concerned with records of the past, it is important that they handle their current problems with up-to-date efficiency.

THE BLENDING OF TRADITIONS IN WESTERN CANADIAN SETTLEMENT

By G. W. SIMPSON

The University of Saskatchewan

WHEN Adam first began to delve, land settlement became an important feature of the story of the human race and the theme has never lost its importance as a basic historical study. Until comparatively recent times the overwhelming majority of mankind was rooted in the soil and even in these days of industrial mobility the "good earth" is the mother-nourisher of nations.

In connection with land settlement a good deal of attention has been directed toward systems of tenure and conditions of ownership. This is undoubtedly a fascinating study which shows that tenure is one of the great regulating instruments of social control. That is not, however, the aspect with which this paper deals. The theme is rather the process of transplanting whereby people in the settlement of new lands bring with them cultural and political traditions which, planted in a new soil, along with the life already growing there, establish a new social and political ecology.

Settlement in Western Canada had much in common with settlement elsewhere in our country, but one of the unique features was the fact that a larger proportion of the settlers was non-British and non-French in origin. According to the census of 1941 approximately 40 per cent of the population in Manitoba, 41 per cent in Alberta, and 47 per cent in Saskatchewan are other than British and French in "racial" origin. This is one of those basic facts which students and writers of Canadian history will be compelled increasingly to assess. Since the development in terms of history is extremely recent, it is not surprising that this feature of settlement has not yet found its proper place in Canadian historiography. As an example of the comparative recentness of this development may be cited the fact that only two years ago all across Western Canada celebrations took place marking the fiftieth anniversary of the coming of the first Ukrainian settlers with their families to Western Canada.¹ On February 14, 1893, Franko Yatsiv, the first Canadian of Ukrainian origin, was born in Winnipeg.² Incidentally Franko was the name of a brilliant contemporary Ukrainian poet and novelist.

There is no need to recall to this gathering the immigration movement from the European continent which began in a trickle in the nineties and swelled to such proportions in the years preceding the first Great War. Justice has been done to the significance of this movement in relation to the economic developments of the period. The building of railways could not have proceeded so swiftly without a rapidly expanding supply of free labour. The prairie lands could not have been made so immediately productive had the number of farmers from Eastern Canada, the United

¹V. A. Czumer, *Spomini pro perezhivannya pershikh ukrayinskikh perecelen siv v Kanadi, 1892-1942* [Recollections of the Experiences of the First Ukrainian Settlers in Canada] *Knizhka tsya napicana z nahodi 50-litnoyi richnitsi poyavi pershikh ukrayinskikh kolonistiv v Kanadi* (Edmonton, 1943), 183. This book was written on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of the coming of the first Ukrainian colonists to Canada.

²Ibid., 183.

States, and Great Britain not been greatly augmented by an agricultural population from Europe. The building of towns and villages in Western Canada under boom conditions could not have proceeded at such break-neck speed had there not been available labour to build, and agricultural population to support this expansion. But the immigration from Europe brought to Canada not simply labourers, farmers, and artisans but it brought to this land people with cultural traditions, historical backgrounds, and maturely developed attitudes of mind which have added new elements to our national life. What is the significance of this fact for Canadian historiography?

It is the primary responsibility of Canadian historians to write the history of the Canadian people. To do this properly it is necessary to go back beyond the period when the people settled in Canada. Thus a good deal of attention has properly been devoted to the detailed cultural and institutional history of the British people prior to the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Similarly space has been given in Canadian history-writing to the France of the seventeenth century and the Gallo-Roman culture preceding that period. But if a chapter has been devoted in Canadian history, as Canadian history, to British background, and a paragraph to early France, hardly more than a footnote has as yet been added to explain the detailed background of that element which has been added to our nation within the present generation. The main facts of European history are, of course, fairly well known and alluded to in Canadian history, but what remains to be done is a close study of the community life from which European Canadians have come. We need to have a proper appreciation of the cultural factors in Europe which conditioned their lives and outlook, and a full understanding of the political attitudes which have been shaped by the experience of generations. The traditions of our Canadian people now reach back to the Vistula, the Dnieper, and Constantinople, as well as to the Thames, the Seine, and Rome.

Historians of institutions like to stress the fact that systems of law, religion, government, and education when once established form a sort of compulsive mould which tends inevitably to fashion and shape the human material which falls within its reach. This is true to a very considerable extent. Nevertheless, in the shaping process the institution itself may undergo various changes of form and spirit, though not necessarily for the better or the worse. In Canada the basic institutions of the country had been firmly established by the time the large European immigration began. The vitality of these established institutions, and the traditions supporting them, becomes a subject of special interest when these institutions and traditions are found in contact with other traditions and institutions. A blending process begins. This is a process already going on in Western Canada. Its definitive history cannot yet be told. An interim glance at what is going on may, however, be of interest.

Forty miles east of Saskatoon lies the Ukrainian Canadian settlement of Meacham.³ To the east are English and Scandinavian settlers, to the

³For the details regarding the Meacham settlement I am indebted to the generous help of W. Burianyk of Saskatoon who gathered the material on the spot with the assistance of friends and relatives in the district. Mr. Burianyk lived in the settlement and taught school there. He is a veteran of the first World War and two members of his family are in the present war. An enthusiastic and public-spirited Canadian, he includes history among his many interests.

south English, and to the west and north French-speaking farmers. The Ukrainian settlement began with the arrival in 1905 of Izydor Nowosad with his family of three sons and four daughters. They came from the village of Bobiatyn in the district of Sokal which lies on the Bug River in north-eastern Galicia. In the following year eight settlers took up land in the same neighbourhood. Six of these were from two villages in the district of Horodenka and two from the same village in the Kolomeya district, both districts being in East Galicia. A larger group of settlers came in 1907. Of the twenty families fourteen were from Horodenka, three from Kolomeya, and three from other parts of East Galicia. There were no new settlers in 1908 but a still larger wave came in 1909. A large proportion of these were from Horodenka though groups from villages in other districts also arrived. By 1910 the Meacham Ukrainian area was fairly solidly settled. A small number of settlers came in during the period 1909 to 1917, for the most part buying out the holdings of the few English-speaking and Scandinavian settlers who found themselves in the midst of the Ukrainians.

The settling of the Ukrainian immigrants together was not the result of any government policy or any colonization scheme. It took place in a most natural and spontaneous fashion. The land was available for all comers. Because of the closely integrated village life in the homeland of Galicia, family relations were as endlessly ramified as in Burke's Peerage. When one family emigrated it tended to bring related families along. In addition to family connection there were close neighbourhood ties which were re-established amidst the great social loneliness and desolation of the New World. The ties originating in the old land were supplemented by ties of comradeship formed amidst the general insecurity and uncertainty of the new land. Men from various districts in the old country worked together in Canada on railways, in lumber camps, or in mines, usually as seasonal labour. They kept in contact with one another, informing each other where and when land was available.

The first few years were years of heavy pioneer toil. Seasonal labour outside the settlement brought in the cash returns for the early development of the homesteads. Small houses with thatched roofs and packed earth floors, resembling cottages in the old land, were the first dwellings. Some of these are still standing, being now used as chicken houses and granaries. Oxen were used for farm work and transport. Before the railway reached Meacham in 1912 supplies had to be brought in from distant railway points. Wheat was ground in Rosthern and Hague, seventy and fifty miles away. The round trip by oxen to these points took from twelve to sixteen days. Gradually tolerable economic adjustment was achieved and the settlers got their economic rooting in the country.

In economic adjustment the Ukrainian immigrants adopted the methods of farming imposed by the general agricultural conditions of the country. The methods employed in this district are now practically indistinguishable from those followed in other districts. In cultural matters the inheritance from the old land is more evident, as one would expect.

On February 7, 1910, a meeting was called in the district to discuss the establishment of a "Chytalnia" or Reading Society. As a result the Society was formed. The inspiration and model for this step came directly from the old country which was witnessing a veritable intellectual renaissance.

sance among the Ukrainian people.⁴ This movement had expressed itself in the formation of reading groups, the establishment of libraries and reading rooms, and the circulation of papers and periodicals. The movement in Galicia was the Ukrainian counterpart of movements elsewhere in Central Europe which expressed the rising national consciousness and intellectual ferment extending itself to the masses.

The little society in Meacham was named after Dr. Teophil Okunevsky, a barrister in Horodenka, Galicia, who had given much of his time and money toward raising the status of the peasant masses in his own country and was at that time a member of the Austrian parliament.⁵ Incidentally, when Dr. Okunevsky learned of the Canadian Society he sent to it eighty books from his own library. The members of the society were assessed one dollar a year for a library fund from which additional books were purchased every year, some from the Ukrainian Bookstore in Winnipeg, some from the United States, and some directly from the old country. The Society also subscribed to four Ukrainian papers, two published in Canada, one in the United States, and one from the motherland. Thus the settlers ensured themselves against intellectual starvation in the new land. On Sundays and holidays the members gathered in designated homes for communal reading and discussion of press articles and books. At the present time the Reading Society has a library of over a thousand volumes, together with a children's library containing some three hundred titles. Here we have a good example of the projection of a European movement into a Canadian community.

Hardly had the Reading Society become established when a public school was put into operation by the Department of Education, and a course of studies based originally largely on the school system and experience of Eastern Canada was presented. Late in 1911 the schoolhouse was built. It was known as the Sichynsky school and the school district still bears the name. The name was given in honour of a young Ukrainian nationalist who had achieved considerable notoriety in Galicia in 1908. The school now became the centre of active community life. Concerts, plays, and socials were held in the schoolhouse. Any financial surpluses in connection with these were used for the enlargement of the library.

It was the school which now became the main institution for the blending of traditions. In the regular hours the pupils were instructed in English and were taught the traditional skills and subjects of a Canadian education. After school hours classes were held for the teaching of the Ukrainian language. From time to time classes were held in the evening for the teaching of English to the adults. Canadian sports such as football, baseball, and softball were enthusiastically adopted by the young people. At the school concerts and community gatherings beautiful Ukrainian music and Ukrainian plays were found side by side with entertainment of British and Canadian origin. The teachers themselves were the keystone in the bridge between the two cultures. They carried out a most exacting programme.

In 1912 the first Church was built and services were held at intervals

⁴D. Doroshenko, *History of the Ukraine* (Edmonton, 1939), chaps. xxvii, xxviii. M. Hrushevsky, *History of the Ukraine* (New Haven, 1941), chaps. xxii, xxiii.

⁵*Ukrayinska zahalna entsiklopediya* [Ukrainian General Encyclopedia] (Lviv, 1933), II, 915.

of one or two months. Up till that year the people were without regular religious ministrations. In the first years the people would gather on important church holidays in one of the larger houses to sing religious songs and recall with poignancy the services and festivals of the old land where the church had played the dominant part in organizing the emotional life of the community. On rare occasions a Greek-Catholic priest had visited the settlement. Now that the church was established the religious life of the community became better organized. The church was under the jurisdiction of the Greek-Catholic bishop newly arrived in Canada.⁶ Seven years later a split occurred among the members over the question of transferring the right to the church property from the congregation to the bishop. Other factors were also involved. The result was that the majority of the congregation opposed the move. At the same time great events in Europe were casting their shadows even as far as the prairies of Western Canada. The move to establish a separate Ukrainian Orthodox Church in the Ukraine was paralleled by a move to set up an autocephalic Ukrainian Orthodox Church in America. The portion of the congregation which had opposed the Greek-Catholic bishop presently joined the newly-established Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church in Canada. The transition from one church allegiance to another could not but revive historic memories, memories not untinged with bitterness. The bitterness has, one is glad to note, been somewhat assuaged, but this re-enactment in Canada of age-old ecclesiastical controversy will be of considerable interest to the future historian of the Canadian people.

By the time of the World War (1914-18) the first generation of children were now growing up in Canada. Their elementary education was being provided for in their home localities. The settlers in various Ukrainian-Canadian communities now became concerned regarding possibilities for higher education. A great deal of serious discussion took place as to what could be done to establish facilities which would assist their children on the road to technical and professional training. Some even suggested the possibility of establishing a Ukrainian College. In the end it was decided to establish a residential institute in Saskatoon to which students might come who wished to attend the University, Collegiate Institute, or Normal School. At the Institute, groups would be organized for instruction in Ukrainian music, drama, history, and language. A general supervision would give them sympathetic guidance which would be needed in a somewhat strange environment. At the same time the students would be pursuing the same courses of study that other Canadians followed in the educational institutions of the city. The Institute which was established in 1917 was called the Peter Mohyla Institute. Peter Mohyla was the seventeenth-century scholar who initiated a valuable educational renaissance in the Ukraine through the establishment of the Kiev Academy.

The settlers at Meacham bought over five thousand dollars worth of non-profit shares in this Institute besides giving more than three thousand dollars in annual donations since. Some sixty-two boys and girls

⁶The establishment of the first Greek-Catholic Church in Canada in 1901 and the subsequent setting up of the general ecclesiastical administration of the Greek-Catholic Church in Canada is told in the Jubilee Almanac, published by the Administration of the Parish of St. Vladimir and Olga Church in Winnipeg in 1936, and written by the Parish head, Dr. V. Kushner—*Yuvileyny almanach ukrayinskoyi hreko—katoliitskoyi tserkvi Sv. Volodimira i Olhi v Vinnytsi*, 30.

from their locality have lived in the Institute while attending the University, Collegiate Institute, or Normal School. Thus the blending process begun in the public school was carried a step further.

The same year that the Meacham community assisted in the establishment of the Peter Mohyla Institute in Saskatoon, they considered the possibility of enlarging the facilities for communal activity in the settlement. The Reading Society took the initiative, having the idea of building a spacious Community Hall. It was to be called the Ukrainian National Home and named after Michael Hrushevsky. At this very time Hrushevsky was President of the Ukrainian Rada which was actually in control of the eastern Ukraine. Greater as a scholar than as a statesman, he is known for his seven-volume *History of the Ukraine* in addition to his five-volume *History of Ukrainian Literature*.⁷ Some four hundred dollars were collected. As this was insufficient the members decided to set up a sort of co-operative selling agency, supplying flour, coal, groceries, tobacco, fence posts, and even some lines of clothing. All profits were to be allocated to the Community Hall fund. By 1925 the accumulated profits from trading, together with funds raised in other ways, amounted to twenty-three hundred dollars. An expert carpenter was hired to supervise the building of the Hall. All the labour was furnished free by the members. Thus a splendid Community Hall worth five thousand dollars was erected without incurring any debt. It is now the social and educational centre of the community. Meetings of all sorts take place there. Matters of immediate public interest are freely discussed concerning all subjects from agricultural welfare and local politics to questions of international affairs. From time to time distinguished visitors, Ukrainian professors, publicists, and artists from the old country and the United States have spoken, sung or played in this hall. Here too the blending of traditions takes place.

I have before me a list of seventy-seven pioneer families who settled in the Meacham district from 1905 to 1917. Before me is also a list of sixty-eight volunteers from the same district who have served or are serving in that greatest of all blending institutions, the Canadian Armed Services. Twenty-two are in the Royal Canadian Air Force, forty-four in the Army, and two in the Navy. There is something profoundly moving as one reads names taken at random such as Nowosad, Bily, Mochoruk, Lazarowich, Bodnarchuk, Kozak, and Korol and finds them on the list of pioneers as well as on the Wartime Roll of Honour. No one can question the gallantry and bravery of Ukrainians, Poles, Greeks, and Serbs fighting now in their own lands or can question the tradition of heroism in their history. As I write now, one of the fighting fronts lies exactly across the Sokal and Horodenka districts from which the fathers of these Meacham Canadian soldiers came. Here in Canada we have nothing to fear from the blending of that tradition with the tradition of French and British pioneers.

DISCUSSION

Father Maheux asked if the religious differences amongst Ukrainians had been an obstacle to their communal life. *Professor Simpson* replied that there is still bitterness evident in some communities but not in this one.

⁷For Hrushevsky's place in Russian historiography, see A. G. Mazur, *An Outline of Modern Russian Historiography* (Berkeley, 1939), 75-8.

Professor Lower stated that he used to fear the Balkanization of Western Canada, but the effect of the stopping of immigration by Mr. Bennett in 1930 has been marked. The various elements have had a chance to become stabilized. He has noticed how well Ukrainian-Canadian students have been fitting themselves in. Unfortunately they still sometimes have difficulty in obtaining employment on account of their non-English names. It is to be hoped that racial prejudice of this sort is disappearing. The Ukrainians are most anxious to take their places as *Canadians* and no longer expect to make "a third community in Canada."

Professor Sage thought it would be a good idea if the Canadian Historical Association would get behind a series of such studies which would give a picture of conditions among all groups.

Professor Trotter thought that the divers cultural strains in the West were no greater than those which went into the early Maritime settlement.

Professor Simpson, in answer to queries about books on Ukrainian background, said that such accounts scarcely exist in English. He also pointed out that at present the Ukrainians are tending to leave the rural regions in large numbers for the cities where they are entering business and industrial life. They are getting control of business life in their rural settlements as well.

Professor Long asked about the comparison of Ukrainian influence in the United States and in Canada. *Professor Simpson* replied that they came to the United States earlier, and went directly into industrial and mining areas; whereas in Canada they went first to agricultural areas.

Professor Brown commented upon the hostility towards the efforts of these people to keep some of their background. This is not justified as their efforts do not keep them from entering Canadian life. He agreed with Professor Lower that such people wish to make a compromise. Hostility has delayed assimilation. He cited his own personal experience as a teacher in a one-room school in a Doukhobor settlement where he lived in a dirt-floor house. He said that the Doukhobors that are extremists are a very small minority. In his community, after the split, those who remained were farmers who were adjusting themselves rapidly to Canadian life. He cited the blending process with respect to cooking. In one family the husband, who knew English better, read recipes from a Canadian cookbook to his wife. Canada should not proceed to standardize all its elements but should accept a pattern of variety, and should abet such efforts as are described in this paper.

THE SETTLEMENT OF NEW BRUNSWICK: AN ADVANCE TOWARD DEMOCRACY

By ESTHER CLARK WRIGHT
Acadia University

THE Province of New Brunswick, it must be remembered, did not come into existence as a separate colony until after the arrival of the United Empire Loyalists. Before 1784, a somewhat indefinite area north of the Bay of Fundy was part of the Province of Nova Scotia, and the first grants of land made after the territory came under British rule were made by the Governor and Council of Nova Scotia. The terms of these grants were influenced by the desire of His Majesty's Government, as set forth in the proclamations issued by Governor Lawrence of Nova Scotia in 1758 and 1759, to fill the area with Protestant settlers in place of the expelled Acadians; the size of the grants was dictated by the desire of the officials to collect large fees; the time of the grants was determined by the coming into force of the Stamp Act on November 1, 1765.

Geographically, the grants of the pre-Loyalist era in New Brunswick may be grouped in four divisions:

(1) Those at the head of the Bay of Fundy, which were the earliest, the most numerous, and the most populous of the New Brunswick grants. They included several small grants to Colonel Joseph Goreham and other officers at Fort Cumberland and to Richard Bulkley, Secretary of Nova Scotia, as well as the townships of Sackville and Cumberland (later Westmorland) near Fort Cumberland, and the townships of Hopewell, Hillsborough, and Monckton, on the Shepody Bay and Petitcodiac River, together with two small grants on the Shepody River.

(2) The St. John River townships, Conway, Gagetown, Burton, Sunbury, Newton, granted to a company, called the Canada Company or St. Johns River Society, consisting of officers of the provincial troops who had assisted in the conquest of Canada and of speculators in the New England and Middle Colonies; the township of Mauderville, granted to a group of settlers from Massachusetts; the township of Francfort, granted to Alexander McNutt and the four companies of Philadelphia merchants and others who were concerned in the grant of Monckton; the township of Amesbury or Olmeston, granted to James Amesbury and other Nova Scotians; several smaller tracts granted to James Simonds, General Gage, Lieutenant William Spry, Philip Livingstone, Arthur Goold, Charles Morris Jr., James and Isaac Caton, William Anderson, and William Jaffray.

(3) Grants on the North Shore, made at the instance of salmon fishermen from Great Britain, a township at the forks of the Miramichi, and smaller tracts on the Nepisiguit and the Baie de Chaleur.

(4) Passamaquoddy Bay grants, the largest of which, a township on the St. Croix River, granted to Governor Bernard of Massachusetts and four English friends, was on the west side of the St. Croix and thus in territory not afterwards included in Nova Scotia or New Brunswick; a grant of 10,000 acres on the peninsula at the mouth of the Maguagadavic River, given John Mascarene in 1767, and an adjoining one of 2000 acres granted Thomas Gamble; and also Indian Island in Passamaquoddy

Bay, which was included with the St. John River townships granted to the officers and speculators.

This list, which has been compiled from the records in the Crown Land Offices of both Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, is a more formidable one than has usually been associated with the period, and it indicates a fairly widespread attempt at settlement of the more desirable areas in the part of Nova Scotia north of the Bay of Fundy.

From the standpoint of success in settlement, the smaller grants may be dismissed briefly. They were made to officers or to traders, and neither class of grantee made any serious effort to effect a settlement of his tract. The only exception was the establishment of James Simonds at the mouth of the St. John River, which did account for a number of families whose breadwinners found employment in the various enterprises, lime-burning, lumbering, fishing, trapping, shipbuilding, started by Simonds and his partners, William Hazen and James White.¹ There was in this case a very close relationship between the trading post at the mouth of the river and the Maugerville settlement up the river, the only relationship of the kind. The small tracts on the Shepody River had been settled by a few families, who were, however, driven out by the rebel marauders during the American Revolutionary War. Their importance lay in the fact that, after the war, they started a movement from the Cornwallis and Horton townships on Minas Basin to the Shepody district, a migration that assumed considerable proportions.²

The earlier townships, Sackville, Cumberland, and Maugerville, whose settlement was projected and begun in the period from 1759 to 1763, were part of that expansion of New England which peopled the Minas Basin region and the coast of the peninsular part of Nova Scotia. The Sackville proprietors were largely from Rhode Island, with a few from Massachusetts; the other two townships were Massachusetts outposts. On any reckoning, proportion of grantees settling, proportion of settlers remaining, acreage under cultivation, effectiveness of occupation, contribution to population and to development of the province in later times, the Maugerville township was the most successful. A study of the record shows that ninety-two persons either owned or had owned lots in the township previous to 1783 or were heads of families living in Maugerville when the Loyalists arrived. There were only eight absentee proprietors, all but one of whom were granted lots because of some connection with the authorities at Halifax. Of the other eighty-four grantees and settlers, three are known to have been present for a few years; one had been banished and another returned to the United States in 1783 or shortly afterwards; four other proprietors are difficult to trace, but seem to have left a descendant or two in the province; five had died, but their widows had re-married in the colony, and two of the deceased had left sons to carry on the name. Subtracting the five who left, the four who are uncertain, and the three who died without heirs, we have seventy-two settlers present when the Loyalists came. All but one of the forty-four surnames distributed among these seventy-two would be recognized as

¹W. O. Raymond, *The River St. John* (Saint John, 1910), and "At Portland Point" (*New Brunswick Magazine*, I, II, 1898, 1899).

²From information in my files.

New Brunswick names and all but two or three are still fairly common. Maugerville was more than 75 per cent successful.³

Sackville, with a total of 274 names on the 1761 list of subscribers, the 1765 list, the 1770 census, the 1773 and 1774 list of proprietors, produces only twenty-seven families still at Sackville in 1783, plus nineteen elsewhere in neighbouring settlements or on the St. John River. Sackville was less than 17 per cent successful. Cumberland, which had grants in 1759, 1763, and 1764, as well as five individual grants, contained only 26 per cent of the grantees in 1770, and less than 20 per cent of the 197 names in the lists of grantees and in the census can be traced after 1783.

So much for the earlier townships. The 1765 townships were of a different order. With the exception of Miramichi, which William Davidson later claimed had been pressed upon him when all he desired was the right to the salmon fishery, the townships granted in 1765 were handed over to groups of speculators who had little or no intention of settling themselves on the land, but hoped to make a profit by selling the land or by putting tenants on it. There were four groups: the officers and their friends who received grants of Conway, Gagetown, Burton, Sunbury, and Newton on the St. John River; four companies of merchants and others from Philadelphia (with whom Alexander McNutt was included, somewhat against their will), who received grants of Monckton on the Petitcodiac and Francfort on the St. John; members of the Nova Scotia Council and their friends, who received grants of Hillsborough on the Petitcodiac and Olmeston on the St. John; a group originating in Pennsylvania, composed of both officers and merchants and on friendly terms with the Nova Scotia Council, who received a grant of Hopewell on Shepody River and Bay.

The St. Johns River Society made a promising beginning under the enthusiastic supervision of Captain Beamsley Glasier, but little came of it, and the efforts of the proprietors had accounted for only ten of the hundred settlers listed in the five townships in 1783. The other settlers were from the Maugerville families or were refugees from other Nova Scotia townships, who had been driven from their homes along the coast by the depredations of the rebel privateers. The Philadelphia companies had not sent any settlers to Francfort (or McNutt's) on the St. John, but had sent a few families to the Petitcodiac Township, Monckton. Seven of these families can be traced: one died out before 1783, two remained at Monckton, four moved to Hillsborough, but members of three of the families returned later to Monckton, when the settlers had brought suit against the proprietors for non-performance of contract and had obtained sheriff's deeds for large portions of the land of the township.⁴

The Nova Scotia Council and their friends were not more successful than the officers and the Philadelphia merchants. Five families are listed as being at Olmeston or Amesbury on the St. John in 1783, but it was not the proprietors' efforts that had placed them there. Hillsborough had four, or perhaps five, Monckton families, a Connecticut family which had

³Crown Land Office, New Brunswick, Memorials, Grant Books, etc. Sunbury County, Registry of Deeds. Family Histories.

⁴I am indebted to Radcliffe College for a Bursary which enabled me to visit the Historical Society of Pennsylvania's Manuscript Department, where information on Monckton and Francfort townships was found in the Hughes Papers. This supplemented materials found in the Crown Land Office and the Registries of Deeds at Dorchester, New Brunswick, and Amherst, Nova Scotia.

wandered in by way of Cornwallis, and several Acadians: other settlers had been present for periods of varying length, but had been forced to seek protection at Fort Cumberland during the Revolutionary War. The fourth group, whose leading personality was General Frederick Haldimand, but whose most active proprietor was Adam Hoops, a Pennsylvania trader, had sent twenty or more families to Hopewell, where they had remained unhappily for two or three years before disappearing, leaving only the agent and three others, who eventually sued the proprietors and obtained sheriff's deeds for large tracts.⁵ (It was the Hopewell tenants who started proceedings and the Monckton ones followed suit.)

It was abundantly evident by the end of the pre-Loyalist period that absentee proprietorship would not work in New Brunswick. Effective settlement was possible only where the grantees were intending settlers, resolute to carve out abiding places for themselves from the wilderness. New Brunswick was not to the manor born.

The lessons of history are always more apparent to later generations, but circumstances dictated that this one must be got by heart immediately. The necessity for the evacuation of thousands of British sympathizers from New York and Penobscot at the close of the American Revolutionary War, and for the disbanding of the provincial regiments, brought to the St. John and the St. Croix so many refugees and soldiers whose claims on account of sufferings and services could not be overlooked, that the fifty-five gentlemen who had not learned the lesson were sent to the foot of the class. The Executive Council of New Brunswick, at one of its early meetings, drew up "Regulations . . . for the orderly and expeditious settlement of the Province of New Brunswick . . ." the tenth and last of which was:

No person petitioning for Lands is to have more than two hundred Acres granted him until the numerous and indigent claimants now in the province shall have been heard and provided for, excepting such of the commissioned and noncommissioned officers of the disbanded corps as shall be willing to take up the quantity to be allowed them in some one of the twelve mile Tracts assigned to the disbanded corps, and drawn for by them. And all persons are required to be as expeditious as possible in their applications that their Lands may be assigned them in season for cultivation the ensuing spring, for which purpose the Governor will sit in Council on the Tuesday and Friday in each week.⁶

⁵Public Archives of Canada, Haldimand Papers, *passim*.

⁶The full text of the Regulations is:

Minutes of the Executive Council of New Brunswick, I, 29-32, between minutes of January 12 and January 14, 1785.

Regulations by order of His Excellency the Governor in Council to be observed for the orderly and expeditious settlement of the Province of New Brunswick by the several persons entitled to, or petitioning for farms, and by all others concerned therein:

First. Every Petition must be reduced to writing and delivered to the Secretary of the Province, that it may be considered in its order by the Governor in Council.

Second. If the petitioner prays for a proportion of vacant Land without specifying a particular spot, his name and place of abode are to be entered in a Register kept for the purpose, that if his request be assented to, he may have an allotment in his Turn.

Third. Whenever a sufficient number of farms are surveyed and ready to be drawn for, public notice will be given to an equal number, first in order on the Register above mentioned to attend in person or by deputy, at a day and place to be appointed, when and where a draft of the several Lots will be made under the inspection of a

This regulation (which, with its fellow clauses, seems to have escaped the notice of historians hitherto) presents a very different picture from that usually drawn by apologists for the American Revolution, who represent the Loyalists as Tory office holders and upholders of class distinctions which did not fit in with the levelling tendencies of American conditions, and with that picture drawn by some New Brunswick writers who imply that most of the Loyalists were members of prominent families and Harvard graduates. My study of the New Brunswick Loyalists has shown that there were only a very, very few members of prominent families and Harvard graduates among them, but that most of them were farmers, shoemakers, weavers, and so forth, from New York, New Jersey, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and Connecticut, and that they belonged to families long settled in those colonies.

The regulation quoted above makes mention of the "Tracts assigned to the disbanded corps." It is not generally understood that the New

Deputy Surveyor and two or more Trustees to be nominated by the Governor, and, as soon thereafter as may be, each person's Lot, so drawn by him, will be shewn and possession given by the Deputy Surveyor aforesaid.

Fourth. If the petitioner asks for a particular Tract and obtains the conditional approbation of the Governor in Council, he is then to publish the substance of his petition for three successive weeks, in the news papers, and also to advertise the same publicly in the settlement nearest to the Land petitioned for, the situation of which is to be so pointed out, that any person having claim thereto may be apprized and an opportunity given him of being heard before the Governor in Council, previous to the issuing of a warrant of Survey for the same; for the whole of which publication the Printers have agreed to take five shillings and no more.

Fifth. All persons who have obtained Warrants of Survey under the Government of Nova Scotia, are to transmit copies to the Secretary without delay, that they may be taken into consideration.

Sixth. All Deputy Surveyors are to make returns to the Secretary of their several surveys, and to specify such Lots as have been drawn for, that the several proprietors may be known, and the unappropriated Lots of each Survey assigned to others.

Seventh. The Agents of the several disbanded Corps, or the senior Officers of each in the province are to transmit to the Secretary without delay a roll containing the present State of the Battalion, Troop, or Company, and enumerating the officers, non-commissioned officers and privates by name, also their Wives and Children together with the place of their residence, that all those who are at present in the province, and unprovided, may have their Lands assigned them.

Eighth. All those Battalions or Companies, not satisfied with their allotments, and willing to take their Lands in any parts at present unoccupied and ungranted of the Tracts assigned for the disbanded Corps, may have farms granted them in such other parts of the said Tracts respectively as they shall apply for before the first of April next; after which time those tracts will be granted to such of His Majesty's Loyal Subjects as shall first apply for them. And for the encouragement of those who will settle above the numbers Six and Seven, the Lots will be laid out forty two rods in front on the river for noncommissioned officers and privates, and eighty two rods for every commissioned officer; and the drafts for such farms are to be made in a public manner as above directed, under the inspection of the Deputy Surveyor, the Agent, and one or more officers of each Battalion, Troop or Company.

Ninth. The Deputy Surveyor, as soon as may be after such draft, will shew each proprietor, or his Deputy, or Agent, the boundaries and marks of the Lot so drawn by him, which will be considered as a delivery of possession.

Tenth. No person petitioning for Lands is to have more than two hundred Acres granted him until the numerous and indigent claimants now in the province shall have been heard and provided for, excepting such of the commissioned or noncommissioned officers of the disbanded corps as shall be willing to take up the quantity to be allowed them in some one of the twelve mile Tracts assigned to the disbanded corps, and drawn for by them. And all persons are required to be as expeditious as possible in their applications that their Lands may be assigned them in season for cultivation the ensuing spring for which purpose the Governor will sit in Council on the Tuesday and Friday in each week.

Brunswick settlers who came after the close of the Revolutionary War were of two classes, soldiers belonging to the provincial forces (the British and British American Troops, Sir Guy Carleton called them in his instructions to Lieutenant Colonel Hewlett, and the same term was used in a petition to Governor Parr in 1784), and refugees who had been forced to leave their homes in the different colonies and had taken refuge in or near New York, or near the fort on the Penobscot. The Penobscot refugees, and some of the troops stationed there, came up to the St. Croix. The New York and Long Island refugees sent Amos Botsford, Samuel Cummings, and Frederick Hauser as agents to look out lands in October, 1782, and on their recommendation decided to settle on the St. John River and the Kennebecasis, where the townships of Conway and Olmeston or Amesbury were escheated for them. It was not until April, 1783, that the commanding officers of "the Provincial Forces now in New York" appointed Lieutenant-Colonel Allen of the Second New Jersey Volunteers, Major Millidge of the First New Jersey Volunteers, and Edward Winslow, Muster Master General, as agents to look out lands for the troops, and they found that the lands nearest the mouth of the St. John River were pre-empted by the refugees, that the desirable lands further up the river were under grant, and that the only opportunity for settling the troops in adjoining tracts—which the authorities were anxious to do for reasons of military expediency—was on the St. John above St. Ann's.

The *Winslow Papers* give hints of the dissatisfaction of the officers and men with the locations provided for them, and the Memorials in the Crown Land Office at Fredericton throw much additional light on the subject. The five regiments whose Blocks were furthest up the river declined to attempt to settle them and obtained permission to look for land elsewhere. On Blocks one to nine, drawn by the Maryland Loyalists, the Second Battalion of New Jersey Volunteers, the Guides and Pioneers, the King's American Dragoons, the Queen's Rangers, the King's American Regiment, the Pennsylvania Loyalists, the First Battalion of DeLancey's Brigade, and the Second DeLancey's, settlement proceeded slowly and with indifferent success. On Block two, for instance, where conditions were particularly favourable, only 8 per cent of the officers and men mustered by the Second New Jersey Volunteers in October, 1783, were named in the re-grant of the Block in 1799. Fifty per cent more can be traced to other parts of the province, but they were not on Block two. Block five was even less successful. The Queen's Rangers, which mustered 268 officers and men in April, 1783, is credited by Thomas Knox with 210 men in the province in September, 1784; about 130 of these are traceable in New Brunswick for longer or shorter periods, but only twenty-nine of them were named on the 1787 grant of Block five, and of the twenty-nine, only thirteen were permanent settlers. On the basis of the total muster of the Queen's Rangers, Block five settlement was barely 5 per cent efficient, or, on the basis of Knox's muster, just over 6 per cent. It is interesting to note that the 1787 grant contained thirty-eight other names, some of men belonging to other regiments, some of refugees, and some of pre-Loyalist families.⁷

It would be tedious to set forth the results for each of the Blocks, but

⁷*Public Archives of Canada*, Muster Rolls of the Loyalist Regiments, Crown Land Office, New Brunswick, Memorials, etc.

checking through the muster rolls and the grants, with later records of deeds and wills, shows a like ineffectiveness of settlement for each regimental Block. Occasionally, it seems as if mere perversity ruled; if a man were assigned land on one side of the river, he preferred the other side; if he were given land down the river, he moved up; if his land fell in a block up the river, he remained at St. Ann's or Saint John. The desire of a wife to be near her own people was often the dominant consideration in the choice of location, an understandable reason in a new country where families of thirteen came to be the rule rather than the exception. Whatever the motives were for moving, it is clear that families had to be free to choose their own land. Settlement by authority did not work.

With the refugees, there was not the same question of dictation by authorities as with the regiments, but there was the question of a few people who felt themselves to be entitled to special privileges. In Parrrtown charges were made that several people received lots "larger or more in number than their just proportion," and the Chief Justice came from Halifax to look into the matter. Something of the story is told in the *Winslow Papers*,⁸ from the standpoint of one of the claimers of privilege, who was smarting under the defeat sustained. Of the awarding of lands outside Parrrtown, there is nowhere an explicit record, but as pieced together from the Memorials and from the grants and records, the story that emerges explains the title I have ventured to use for this paper.

The authorities at Parrrtown were evidently overwhelmed by the numbers who were sent up from New York, and handled the problem badly. Sometimes they told the Loyalists to go up the river and settle on unoccupied land. When the settlers had cleared a bit of ground and put up a hut, somebody else would come along with a ticket for the lot which he had received in a drawing, or one of the old inhabitants would appear with a claim to the land. Surveyors made hasty surveys and divisions of blocks of land, and reported them to the authorities, who announced lotteries. Some people drew blanks time and time again; others, smiled upon by fortune or by the holders of the lottery, drew lot after lot. The confusion and ill feeling increased as the months went on, and it is greatly to the credit of the newly arrived Governor and his Council that they recognized the incompetence and unfairness of the business and took immediate steps to regularize procedure and prevent unfair discrimination.

One of the most successful of the Loyalist settlements was Kingston, which was about on a par with Maugerville in contribution to the population and development of New Brunswick. A group of settlers, largely from Connecticut, arriving on the *Ship Union*, elected three of their number to choose a site, accepted the recommendation of their representatives and established the town of Kingston, at the head of a creek joining the Belleisle. In contrast was Gagetown, which fell into the hands of an oligarchy, who were so particular about the people they admitted to the privileges of the town for which they anticipated a brilliant future, that when the list for the town plot was drawn up in 1792, there were only fifteen families named and six of those had most of the lots. Gagetown remained aristocratic, but, in spite of its strategic position and other advantages, unpopulated.

⁸W. O. Raymond (ed.), *Winslow Papers* (Saint John, 1901), 180-7.

Neither absentee proprietorship nor settlement by authority was successful in New Brunswick. Pre-Loyalist and Loyalist experience both show that democratic techniques were necessary for effective settlement of the province.

DISCUSSION

Father Maheux suggested that a paper on French-Canadian settlement in New Brunswick be prepared along similar lines.

Professor Lower remarked upon the large grants of land given to certain people. This was so in every settlement project he said. Avidity for land and land speculation were to be found from the earliest days in every part of Canada.

M. Lefebvre cited the cases of large grants given in the Province of Quebec during the last century.

Professor Sage was pleased to hear about the pre-Loyalist settlers. He said it has taken many years for the Canadian public to learn about this element. The story of the New England connections should be more thoroughly explored.

Professor Trotter stated that ignorance of the pre-Loyalists was not confined to "former times" in Ontario. His students today are startled to hear about this group. Mrs. Wright's paper points the way to similar studies. Father Maheux's suggestion should be followed up. Also a study of Irish settlement along the Mirimachi should be undertaken. Such studies would reveal the diverse traditions which have gone into the making of Canada.

LE REGIME SEIGNEURIAL ET L'EXPANSION DE LA COLONISATION DANS LE BASSIN DU SAINT-LAURENT AU DIX-HUITIEME SIECLE

Par GUY FRÉGAULT
Université de Montréal

ON saisit toute de suite le lien qui rattache le régime seigneurial à l'expansion de la colonisation dans le bassin du Saint-Laurent. C'est une relation de cause à effet.

I

Prenons d'abord une vue d'ensemble de ce phénomène matériel déterminé—surtout mais non pas uniquement—par une cause sociale. Rappelons quelques dates qui constituent autant de points de repère dans la conquête progressive du sol. Québec surgit en 1608; en 1634, un essaim se pose aux Trois-Rivières; le grand arbre que sera plus tard Montréal se plante dans la Ville-Marie de 1642. Voilà trois foyers de colonisation destinés à briller d'une lumière de plus en plus vive, qui embrasera bientôt les deux rives du Saint-Laurent. Puis, vient l'intendant Talon, qui s'appuiera sur l'immigration, sur la fécondité naturelle de la Nouvelle-France, et sur les vétérans de Carignan-Salières, pour imprimer un essor sans précédent à la marche en avant de la civilisation. A son départ, en 1672, la colonie française de Canada décrit deux lignes parallèles sur les bords du fleuve, entre Lachine et le Cap Tourmente; ce double ruban s'allonge sur une distance de plus de deux cents milles. Par malheur, une guerre intermittente de trente ans avec les sauvages, puis avec les Anglais, entrave le développement de la Nouvelle-France. Le mouvement démographique est très lent: avant Talon, en 1663, on compte tout au plus 2,500 Canadiens; en 1685, après le grand effort de Louis XIV, ils sont 10,725. Après la guerre de la Ligue d'Augsbourg, en 1698, la population ne s'élève encore qu'à 13,815 Français, auxquels on ajoute 1,540 sauvages alliés.¹ Huit ans plus tard, le pays ne s'est pas augmenté de trois mille âmes; il compte seulement 16,417 habitants.² La guerre de la Succession d'Espagne se termine en 1713; cette année-là, la population canadienne se chiffre par 18,119 âmes.³ La mise en valeur du sol obéit au même rythme: en 1698, il y a 32,524 arpents de terre en culture et 5,159 en pâturages;⁴ en 1706, les terres cultivées forment une étendue totale de 43,671 arpents.⁵ Il y a un siècle que la colonisation française a entrepris son œuvre dans la vallée du Saint-Laurent; tel est alors le bilan de ses efforts, de ses déboires et de ses succès.

Dans l'évolution historique du Canada, le dix-huitième siècle ne commence réellement qu'à la fin des guerres de Louis XIV, après le traité d'Utrecht. Voici une paix qui durera trente ans; on manifeste tout de suite l'intention bien compréhensible de la mettre à profit; dès 1716, le gouverneur de Vaudreuil lance le mot d'ordre: "Profiter de la paix pour fortifier le Canada."⁶ Aussi l'époque qui commence s'ouvre-t-

¹"Recensements du Canada, 1665-1871," dans *Recensement du Canada, 1870-1871* (Ottawa, 1876), V. 40.

²*Ibid.*, 48.

³*Ibid.*, introduction, xxi.

⁴*Ibid.*, 41.

⁵*Ibid.*, 48.

⁶"Extraits du mémoire de M. de Vaudreuil," février 1716, Archives de la Province de Québec, Correspondance de Vaudreuil, n.p. (Dorénavant cité de la façon suivante: APQ, Corr. de Vaudreuil).

elle sous le signe du relèvement. La grande cause de la faiblesse de la Nouvelle-France a toujours été le manque d'hommes. La nature a richement doté le pays: ses terres sont fertiles, ses forêts sont immenses et drues, ses mines sont abondantes, ses pêcheries pourraient rapporter beaucoup, son système fluvial est unique au monde; un observateur pourra cependant noter avec beaucoup de sens: "Le manque d'hommes et le peu de fortune des particuliers est cause que ces richesses sont ensevelies."⁷ Le gouvernement colonial veut organiser une bonne politique de peuplement. L'immigration est insignifiante; en quarante ans, de 1714 à 1754, on a calculé que la métropole n'envoie au Canada que quatre mille recrues;⁸ nombre misérable, dont il faut encore déduire des non-valeurs. Pendant ce temps, la colonie même accomplit un effort incomparablement plus généreux. Les diverses données des recensements sont significatives à cet égard. Six ans après le traité d'Utrecht, la population du Canada se chiffre par 22,530 habitants;⁹ par 24,591, en 1721;¹⁰ par 33,682, en 1730;¹¹ par 37,716, en 1734;¹² par 42,701, en 1739.¹³ C'est le dernier chiffre que nous possédions jusqu'en 1754, alors que le nombre des habitants du Canada s'élève à 55,009 âmes.¹⁴ Il en résulte que, durant la période de quarante ans qui s'écoule entre 1714 et 1754, le nombre des Canadiens a plus que triplé. Voilà un résultat remarquable, obtenu en dépit des maladies épidémiques, dont Ruette d'Auteuil signalait, en 1713, les ravages périodiques¹⁵ et qui, dans la seule années 1732-33, enlevaient près de deux mille personnes.¹⁶

A l'accroissement de la population correspond une avance analogue de la colonisation. Il y a longtemps que l'on déplore la dispersion des forces au Canada et l'incohérence de l'effort colonisateur, faits consacrés par la concession de seigneuries éloignées des centres les plus peuplés. En 1716, un observateur recommandait qu'il fût interdit aux Canadiens de s'établir au delà de Montréal, "vu la longueur et la difficulté de la navigation."¹⁷ Plus tard, le ministre Pontchartrain remarquait: "Le génie des peuples de la Nouvelle-Angleterre est de bien travailler à cultiver sa terre et de pousser les Etablissements de proche en proche... Les habitants de la nouvelle France pensent différemment. Ils voudroient aller toujours en avant sans s'embarrasser des établissements de l'intérieur."¹⁸ C'est beaucoup, semble-t-il, pour lutter contre cette fâcheuse tendance à la dispersion que, durant plus de quinze ans, la métropole, nous le verrons, refusera de distribuer de nouveaux fiefs.

⁷"Mémoire sur L'état du Canada pendant les dernières années de la paix," s.d., Archives des Colonies, Canada, vol. 96, folio 224 (Dorénavant cité de la façon suivante: AC, C 11A).

⁸I. Caron, *La Colonisation du Canada sous la domination française* (Québec, 1916), 58.

⁹"Recensements du Canada, 1665-1871," 52.

¹⁰*Ibid.*, 53. ¹¹*Ibid.*, intro., xxii. ¹²*Ibid.*, 57. ¹³*Ibid.*, 60.

¹⁴*Ibid.*, 61. Vers 1750, les colonies américaines comptaient un million d'habitants. À cette date, la population de la France doublait celle de l'Angleterre: la première s'élevait à douze millions d'âmes, tandis que celle-ci s'établissait à six millions. Cf. H. I. Priestley, *France Overseas through the Old Regime: A Study of European Expansion* (New-York et Londres, 1939), 239, note 14.

¹⁵Mémoire au Duc d'Orléans, 12 décembre 1715, *Rapport de l'Archiviste de la Province de Québec* (dorénavant cité sous le sigle RAPQ), 1922-23, 64.

¹⁶Beauharnais et Hocquart à Maurepas, 14 octobre 1733, AC, C 11A, 59: 138.

¹⁷"Mémoire Instructif des Intentions de Sa Majesté, pour le Gouverneur et l'Intendant de Canada," 1716, AC, C 11A, 36: 38.

¹⁸Maurepas à Beauharnais, 14 mai 1728, Archives des Colonies, Ordres du Roi (dorénavant cité sous le sigle: AC, B), 52: 501v.

A partir de 1731, la distribution des concessions reprend. Il reste très peu de vides à combler en bordure du fleuve, entre Québec et Montréal; en quelques années, toutes les devantures sont prises, si bien qu'en 1749 le naturaliste Pierre Kalm comparera les établissements contigus des rives du Saint-Laurent à "un village continu commençant à Montréal et finissant à Québec, sur une ligne de plus de cent quatre-vingts milles."¹⁹ Il faut alors tailler dans la profondeur des terres un deuxième, quand ce n'est pas un troisième rang de concessions; on en dessine en haut de l'île de Montréal, on en établit également en bas de Québec, sur la rive sud.²⁰ En haut de Montréal, on pousse jusqu'à Châteauguay et jusqu'à la rivière Bodet; en même temps, la colonie provigne sur l'Outaouais où, du côté droit, Rigaud s'articule à Vaudreuil, pendant que, du côté gauche, la seigneurie d'Argenteuil étend considérablement la zone colonisée. Les progrès sont moins marquants sur le bas Saint-Laurent où, cependant, le fief de la rivière Ouelle avance ses frontières, pendant que naissent deux nouvelles seigneuries, celles de Rioux et de Saint-Barnabé, qui s'imbriquent, d'une part, entre Dartigny et le Bic et, d'autre part, entre Rimouski et Lessard.²¹

De tout temps, la stratégique région du Richelieu a fortement tenté les Canadiens. Talon, on le sait, voulait y fonder de solides établissements militaires dans le double but de refouler les maraudeurs iroquois et de bloquer un boulevard d'invasion naturellement ouvert aux colonies rivales. C'est un pays fertile. Mais la guerre, surtout la guerre iroquoise, dont les ravages laissent encore des traces dans la gouvernment de Montréal dix ans et plus après la conclusion de la grande paix de Callières,²² a empêché de la mettre en valeur. La seigneurie de Chambly dont les terres, estimait Catalogne en 1712, "sont très propres pour produire toutes sortes de grains et légumes," ne nourrit encore que "très peu d'habitans." Pourtant, poursuit-il, "les bois construction y sont plus beaux et abondants qu'au reste du gouvernement, particulièrement les pins" et la vallée du Richelieu pourrait facilement permettre à "plus de mil habitans" d'y faire leur vie.²³ Les guerres anglo-iroquoises surtout et aussi la négligence des seigneurs, chefs militaires plutôt que colonisateurs, ont paralysé la marche du progrès. Cependant, au moment où la Cour permet aux administrateurs coloniaux de concéder de nouveaux fiefs, l'intendant Hocquart, homme d'action qui s'attache, dirait-on, à reprendre le vaste programme jadis ébauché par Talon, s'applique avec une belle ardeur à développer la région et à pousser les établissements jusqu'au lac Saint-Frédéric. Entre 1733 et 1739, il confie des seigneuries à Sabrevois, à Noyan, à LaFontaine de Belcourt, à Foucault, à Chaussegros de Léry, à Péan, à Denys de La Ronde, à Ramezay.²⁴ Mais le gros effort de l'intendant se porte vers le fort Saint-Frédéric, dont il voudrait faire non seulement une station militaire mais aussi un centre de colonisation. Les habitants qui s'y fixeront, raisonne-t-il, pourront

¹⁹L. W. Marchand (éd.), *Voyages de Pierre Kalm dans l'Amérique septentrionale* (Mémoires de la Société historique de Montréal, 8e livraison, 1880), 61.

²⁰Cf. Caron, *La Colonisation du Canada sous la domination française*, 61-3.

²¹E. Salone, *La Colonisation de la Nouvelle-France* (Paris, 1906), 365.

²²Cf. G. de Catalogne, "Mémoire sur les plans des seigneuries et habitations des gouvernements de Québec, les Trois-Rivières et Montréal," [1712], dans W. B. Munro (éd.), *Documents Relating to the Seigniorial Tenure in Canada* (Toronto, 1908), 99, 101, 102, 104, 106, 114, 115, etc.

²³*Ibid.*, 118.

²⁴Salone, *La Colonisation de la Nouvelle-France*, 365.

ravitailleur le fort, ce qui diminuera les frais de transport, toujours onéreux, et réduira d'autant les dépenses occasionnées par le maintien de Saint-Frédéric. Il imagine d'y fonder une seigneurie du roi qui s'étendrait sur six lieues de front devant la forteresse; les concessions seraient de trois arpents sur quarante, à charge d'un sol par arpent de front, de vingt sols par arpent de superficie, et de trois minots de blé par concession: cela donnerait au roi dix livres par habitant pour l'entretien du fort.²⁵ Voilà un projet intéressant. Le roi l'approuve sans réserve. En vue de stimuler le zèle des colons, il permet même à l'intendant de fournir 150 livres aux six premières familles qui voudront s'établir sur sa seigneurie et de les dispenser pendant trois ans de tout versement de cens et rentes.²⁶ Aussitôt, Hocquart envoie le grand voyer Lanouiller de Boisclerc borner le domaine du roi et tracer les plans de quatre-vingt-dix terres ouvertes aux habitants.²⁷ Deux ans plus tard, quelques colons s'y sont fixés et ont déjà "fait des défrichements considérables."²⁸ Au début de la guerre de la Succession d'Autriche, quatorze familles tiennent feu et lieu aux alentours de Saint-Frédéric;²⁹ quatre nouveaux seigneurs s'occupent également de faire mettre les terres en culture.³⁰ Les débuts sont si prometteurs que Mgr Dosquet manifeste l'intention d'y ériger une paroisse et nomme un desservant; mais de l'avis de l'intendant, il convient d'attendre le retour de la paix avant d'y envoyer un curé.³¹ En 1746, la guerre dure déjà depuis deux ans entre la France et l'Angleterre et les habitants abandonnent leurs terres les uns après les autres;³² Ils n'y retourneront pas avant 1749.³³ En somme, malgré le grand désir de Hocquart de fonder un puissant établissement sur le lac Champlain et de pousser la colonisation de la vallée du Richelieu jusqu'au fort Saint-Frédéric,³⁴ la guerre vint interrompre l'œuvre de l'intendant au moment où le succès semblait devoir récompenser ses efforts.

C'était donc, à tout prendre, un échec; mais un échec amplement compensé par les belles réalisations qui s'accomplissaient dans la vallée de la Chaudière. A cause de sa fertilité, cette région reçut le nom de Nouvelle-Beauce, nom qui apparaît pour la première fois, semble-t-il, dans le recensement de 1739.³⁵ L'intendant y fit distribuer sept concessions entre 1736 et 1738. Les nouveaux seigneurs travaillèrent consciencieusement à la mise en valeur de leurs terres. En 1745, Hocquart était tout fier d'annoncer au ministre que les habitants de la région avaient récolté 3,000 minots de blé outre la quantité de céréales nécessaires à leur subsistance.³⁶ Ce résultat avait quelque chose d'inespéré. Une autre circonstance devait favoriser la Nouvelle-Beauce: les armées anglo-américaines d'invasion de la guerre de Sept Ans, qui perpétrèrent des déprédations auprès desquelles les anciens raids iroquois étaient des

²⁵ Beauharnais et Hocquart à Maurepas, 11 octobre 1737, AC, C 11A, 67: 11-12.

²⁶ Mémoire du Roy à Beauharnais et Hocquart, 15 mai 1738, AC, C 11A, 69: 49-51.

²⁷ Lanouiller de Boisclerc à Maurepas, 29 octobre 1739, AC, C 11A, 71: 48.

²⁸ Beauharnais et Hocquart à Maurepas, 3 octobre 1741, AC, C 11A, 75: 33-4.

²⁹ Mémoire du Roy à Beauharnais et Hocquart, 24 mars 1744, AC, B 78: 28-28v.

³⁰ Hocquart à Maurepas, 16 octobre 1745, AC, C 11A, 83: 376-7.

³¹ Dosquet à Maurepas, 10 novembre 1746, AC, C 11A, 86: 140.

³² Beauharnais et Hocquart à Maurepas, 7 octobre 1746, AC, C 11A, 85: 49.

³³ *Voyages de Pierre Kalm dans l'Amérique septentrionale*, 33.

³⁴ [Hocquart], "Canada, Détail de toute la Colonie," [1737], dans *Collection de mémoires et de relations sur l'histoire ancienne du Canada, publiée sous la direction de la Société littéraire et historique de Québec* (Québec, 1840), 8-9.

³⁵ "Recensements du Canada, 1665-1871," 60.

³⁶ Hocquart à Maurepas, 16 octobre 1745, AC, C 11A, 83: 376.

entreprises d'amateurs, épargnèrent par hasard la vallée de la Chaudière; ainsi, en 1765, alors qu'un grand nombre d'habitants des autres seigneuries, n'ayant pas eu le temps de reconstruire leurs maisons dévastées, vivaient encore dans des cabanes de troncs d'arbres,³⁷ ceux de la Nouvelle-Beauce cultivaient tranquillement leurs terres; leur nombre s'élevait à 852.³⁸

En résumé, le mouvement de colonisation qui marque le dernier demi-siècle du régime français se dessina le long des rives du Saint-Laurent, qui furent totalement défrichées; il prit aussi une direction tangentielle des deux côtés de l'Outaouais, dans la vallée du Richelieu, et dans celle de la Chaudière. Mentionnons pour mémoire un effort colonisateur du côté des pays d'en haut, notamment autour de Détroit.³⁹ Plus tard, La Galissonnière devait élaborer un projet pratique et peu coûteux en vue de mettre en valeur le pays des Illinois.⁴⁰ Il ne saurait en être question ici, puisqu'il ne s'agit que du développement du bassin du Saint-Laurent.

II

Nous voilà donc en présence d'un remarquable phénomène d'expansion. Une seule cause ne saurait évidemment en donner l'explication. La colonisation se rattache à la vie économique et à la vie sociale d'un groupe humain; elle procède par conséquent de causes économiques et sociales. Il serait vain d'ignorer les premières. Au lendemain de la paix d'Utrecht, la Nouvelle-France était un pays de misère: l'abus de la monnaie de carte avait plongé la colonie dans une grave crise monétaire d'où le Canada ne sortirait qu'après avoir perdu la moitié de sa richesse nominale;⁴¹ la chute de la Compagnie de la Colonie avait désorganisé son commerce vital, la traite des fourrures;⁴² l'agriculture périlait à tel point que le gouverneur et l'intendant écrivaient: "Il y a tout lieu de craindre que la plupart des terres ne deviennent incultes, les habitants ne trouvant pas de monde pour les faire valoir."⁴³ Pour le pays, il s'agissait de se redresser ou de mourir. Les administrateurs coloniaux tracèrent un vaste plan de relèvement: en articulant le Canada aux marchés extérieurs—à l'Ile Royale, aux Antilles, à la France—ils mirent les habitants à même d'exporter le surplus de leurs produits, de leur blé surtout, ce qui donna impulsion inespérée à l'agriculture et donc à la mise en valeur du sol; en améliorant les routes de la Nouvelle-France, ils relièrent entre elles les diverses régions de la colonie, ce qui eut pour effet de

³⁷"Dans les quelques titres-nouveaux de cette époque que nous avons pu consulter dans les papiers d'anciennes familles, une note qui revient sans cesse nous a frappé. En décrivant l'état de la propriété, le notaire ne manque jamais de dire que l'habitation a été incendiée pendant le siège. En 1765, plusieurs habitants vivaient encore dans des cabanes faites de troncs d'arbres, n'ayant pas les moyens de reconstruire leurs demeures" (J.-E. Roy, *Histoire de la seigneurie de Lauzon*, 5 vols., Lévis, 1897-1904, III, 14).

³⁸"Recensements du Canada, 1665-1871," 65.

³⁹Beauharnais et Hocquart à Maurepas, 12 octobre 1735, AC, C 11A, 63: 40.

⁴⁰La Galissonnière à Maurepas, 1 septembre 1748, AC, C 11A, 91: 105-7.

⁴¹Pontchartrain à Vaudreuil et Bégon, 23 mai 1714, dans A. Shortt (éd.), *Documents relatifs à la monnaie, au change et aux finances du Canada sous le régime français*, 2 vols. (Ottawa, 1925), I, 266-70; Pontchartrain à Bégon, 23 mai 1714, *ibid.*, 270.

⁴²Cette crise économique est exposée avec beaucoup de clarté par F. H. Hammang, *The Marquis de Vaudreuil: New France at the Beginning of the Eighteenth Century* (Bruges, 1938), 91-106.

⁴³Vaudreuil et Bégon à Pontchartrain, 20 septembre 1714, AC, C 11A, 34: 297.

stimuler les échanges commerciaux et de reculer les frontières des territoires colonisés. Ce dernier point mérite une attention particulière. Au début du dix-huitième siècle, le pays ne possède en réalité qu'une seule grande route, le fleuve, impraticable durant la moitié de l'année et toujours d'une navigation difficile.⁴⁴ Enfin, en 1730, l'énergique Lanouiller de Boisclerc occupe la fonction de grand voyer⁴⁵ et il recevra l'appui entier de l'intendant Hocquart.⁴⁶ Bientôt un magnifique réseau de routes sillonne le pays. En 1733, on a presque terminé un chemin autour du lac Saint-Pierre, on en a tracé d'autres autour du nœud de communications qu'est déjà Montréal, à Longueuil, à Boucherville, à Varennes, dans l'Ile Jésus, dans l'Ile de Montréal et, enfin, dans les côtes de Terrebonne, de La Chesnaye, de La Valtrie.⁴⁷ Surtout, on réussit à relier par terre Québec à Montréal: le trajet peut facilement s'accomplir en quatre jours avec le même cheval.⁴⁸ Du printemps à l'automne, Lanouiller parcourt les côtes, pressant les travaux.⁴⁹ En 1735, la route entre Montréal et Québec devient carrossable et le grand voyer raconte, triomphant, qu'il n'a mis que quatre jours à la parcourir en voiture.⁵⁰ Le résultat ne se fait pas attendre. La colonisation prend une ampleur soudaine. Partout, le long des chemins du roi, des habitants s'établissent, des groupes laborieux s'accrochent à des coins de terre jusqu'alors fermés au travail.⁵¹

Telles sont, en deux mots, les raisons économiques de l'expansion de la colonisation canadienne au dix-huitième siècle. La cause sociale nous intéresse davantage. Il faut la trouver dans l'application du régime seigneurial. La féodalité canadienne, on le sait, n'avait pas été établie dans le but de permettre à une caste privilégiée de vivre du travail d'une classe inférieure, mais bien en vue de doter le pays de l'organisation économico-sociale qui lui convenait. C'est là son trait caractéristique, celui qui la distinguait du système existant en Europe à la même époque.⁵² C'est surtout au cours du dix-huitième siècle que ce trait devait s'accroître. Il nous faut remonter un peu en arrière pour saisir la portée de cette évolution.

Dans l'esprit de Louis XIV, le système seigneurial, tel que fonctionnant en Nouvelle-France, n'avait qu'une raison d'être: assurer la colonisation du pays. Dès 1672, le roi s'attaquait énergiquement à ce problème. Vu la lenteur du défrichement, il ordonnait à Talon de rédiger un rapport sur la valeur et l'étendue des seigneuries et décidait que la moitié des terres concédées avant 1663 seraient réunies au domaine royal

⁴⁴Dupuy à Maurepas, 20 octobre 1727, AC, C 11A, 49: 421-2.

⁴⁵Hocquart à Maurepas, 16 octobre 1730, AC, C 11A, 53: 51; "Provisions de l'office de Grand-Voyer pour le Sieur Lanouiller de Boisclerc," 10 avril 1731, *Edits, ordonnances royaux, déclarations et arrêts du Conseil d'Etat du Roi concernant le Canada* (dorénavant cité: *Edits et ordonnances*), 3 vols. (Québec, 1854-6), III, 100-101.

⁴⁶"Ordonnance qui enjoint à tous les capitaines et officiers de milice de la colonie de faire travailler aux chemins et ponts publics, tous les habitants dans leurs districts respectifs," 5 juin 1730, *ibid.*, 460.

⁴⁷Lanouiller de Boisclerc à Maurepas, 17 octobre 1733, AC, C 11A, 60: 179-80.

⁴⁸*Ibid.*, 180-1.

⁴⁹Hocquart à Maurepas, 14 octobre 1733, AC, C 11A, 60: 67.

⁵⁰Lanouiller de Boisclerc à Maurepas, 31 octobre 1735, AC, C 11A, 64: 111.

⁵¹Hocquart à Maurepas, 14 octobre 1733, AC, C 11A, 60: 65-7; *id.* à *id.*, 7 octobre 1736, AC, C 11A, 66: 8; Hocquart à Maurepas, 11 octobre 1737, AC, C 11A, 68: 16-17; Lanouiller de Boisclerc à Maurepas, 29 octobre 1739, AC, C 11A, 71: 47-8.

⁵²Cf. H. Sée, *Esquisse d'une histoire économique et sociale de la France depuis les origines jusqu'à la guerre mondiale* (Paris, 1929), 224-34.

pour être confiées à des seigneurs plus diligents.⁵³ L'exécution de cet arrêt fut remise à plus tard; il eut tout de même pour résultat d'engager les seigneurs à surveiller plus étroitement leurs censitaires.⁵⁴ En 1679, le roi revenait à la charge; constatant que les seigneuries étaient "d'une si grande étendue que la plus grande partie est demeurée inutile aux propriétaires, faute d'hommes et de bestiaux pour les mettre en valeur," il ordonnait qu'à partir de 1680, on retranchât aux seigneurs, tous les ans, un vingtième de leurs fiefs laissés en friche.⁵⁵ Mais l'inaction des seigneurs était de celles que l'on ne saurait combattre à coups de décrets; puis, laissés à eux-mêmes, il n'était que trop naturel qu'ils multipliasent les abus.

En 1707, l'intendant Raudot décrit, dans une dépêche importante, les pratiques injustes et d'une honnêteté parfois douteuse que se permettent certains détenteurs de fiefs. "L'esprit des affaires, déplore tout d'abord l'intendant, qui a toujours plus de subtilité et de chicane, qu'il n'a de vérité et de droiture, a commencé à s'introduire ici depuis quelque temps et augmente tous les jours. . . ."⁵⁶ En concédant les terres, les seigneurs seraient censés donner aux habitants des titres écrits définissant clairement les limites de la concession et les conditions auxquelles elle est accordée. Or, on omet souvent cette formalité et les censitaires trop confiants en subissent les conséquences. Il arrive en effet que des habitants s'établissent sur une terre après entente verbale avec le seigneur ou encore munis de billets de concession qui ne définissent pas les charges auxquelles ils seront soumis. Plus tard, le seigneur survient avec des exigences très onéreuses. Le censitaire se voit placé devant cette alternative: se soumettre ou s'en aller, en perdant le fruit de ses travaux; plutôt que d'abandonner ses quatre coins de terre, l'habitant préfère accepter les conditions léonines que lui impose le feudataire trop adroit.⁵⁷ D'autres contrats de concession portent que les redevances seront payables en argent ou en nature; lorsque les denrées sont rares et chères, le seigneur exige un versement en nature; quand les récoltes sont abondantes, ce qui entraîne l'avisement des prix, il n'accepte rien que de l'argent.⁵⁸ Certains seigneurs introduisent le droit de four banal, dont les censitaires ne peuvent pas profiter à cause de l'étendue des seigneuries et de la rigueur des hivers; ces derniers paient donc pour un droit dont ils ne peuvent pas se prévaloir.⁵⁹

Afin de combattre ces abus, Raudot propose des réformes radicales:

Je croirais donc . . . que pour mettre les choses dans une espèce d'uniformité et faire aux habitants la justice que les seigneurs ne leur ont point faite jusqu'à présent et les empêcher de leur faire dans la suite les vexations auxquelles ils seront sans doute exposés, il serait nécessaire que Sa Majesté donnât une déclaration qui réformât et qui réglât même pour l'avenir, tous les droits et rentes que les seigneurs se sont donnés et qu'ils se donneront dans la suite et que S. M.

⁵³ "Arrêt du Conseil d'Etat du Roy pour retrancher la moitié des concessions," 4 juin 1672, *Edits et ordonnances*, I, 70-1.

⁵⁴ Cf. W. B. Munro, *The Seigneurial System in Canada: A Study in French Colonial Policy* (Cambridge, Mass., 1907), 37.

⁵⁵ "Retranchement des concessions de trop grande étendue et ordre d'en disposer," 9 mai 1679, *Edits et ordonnances*, I, 233-4.

⁵⁶ Jacques Raudot à Pontchartrain, 10 novembre 1707, APQ, Manuscrits concernant la Nouvelle-France, X, 456.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 459.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 460.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 461.

ordonnât qu'ils prissent seulement par chaque arpent de ce que contiendraient leurs concessions, un sol de rente et un chapon par chaque arpent de front, ou vingt sols au choix du redevable; qu'on supprimât la clause de préférence que le seigneur se donne dans la vente pour les héritages roturiers; qu'on supprimât aussi le droit de four banal; que dans les endroits où il y a de la pêche on réduisît les droits du seigneur au 10^e purement et simplement sans autre condition; qu'on conservât au seigneur le droit de banalité en faisant bâtir dans leurs seigneuries un moulin dans un an sinon qu'on les déclarât déchus de leurs droits sans que les habitants fussent obligés, lorsqu'il y en aurait un de bâti, d'y aller faire moudre leurs grains....

A cette liste déjà longue de réformes, Jacques Raudot en ajoute une autre, visant à simplifier les affaires judiciaires "en diminuant les degrés de juridiction que les habitants ont à essuyer; ils sont obligés d'abord de procéder devant les juges des seigneurs dans les endroits où il y en a d'établis, ensuite par appel aux prévôts dont ils ressortissent et enfin en dernier ressort au Conseil," ce qui leur nuit grandement, "puisque le temps qu'ils devraient donner au travail, on leur en fait consommer la plus grande partie à plaider."⁶⁰

Si la métropole avait décidé d'appliquer les remèdes proposés par Raudot, la structure même de la féodalité canadienne en eût été modifiée. Le ministre esquisse bien de timides mouvements dans ce sens mais il appartenait au roi d'agir à sa façon.⁶¹ Il le fit en promulguant les deux arrêts de Marly, du 6 juillet 1711. Les arrêts de Marly marquent un tournant dans l'histoire du système seigneurial. Ils constituent une mesure de protection pour les habitants, qu'ils soustraient aux exactions des seigneurs, et pour les seigneurs, qu'ils protègent de l'esprit spéculateur de certains colons. Le premier de ces deux documents concernent les détenteurs de fiefs, l'autre les censitaires.

Avant 1711, un seigneur pouvait refuser de concéder des terres aux habitants et il profitait parfois de ce droit pour spéculer sur son fief et exiger des censitaires des sommes d'argent outre les redevances habituelles. Après 1711, les propriétaires de fiefs devront "concéder aux habitants les terres qu'ils leur demanderont dans leurs seigneuries à titre de redevances et sans exiger d'eux aucune somme d'argent pour raison des dites concessions"; bien plus, sur le refus d'un seigneur de pourvoir à sa demande, le censitaire peut porter plainte auprès du gouverneur et de l'intendant et ceux-ci contraindront le seigneur de fournir de la terre à l'habitant sans que le premier prétende toucher aucun droit sur cette concession consentie de mauvaise grâce.⁶² Les administrateurs coloniaux appliqueront cette disposition. En 1721, les religieuses de l'Hôtel-Dieu de Québec refusent à une veuve de lui donner l'étendue de terre qu'elle demande; priés d'intervenir, le gouverneur et l'intendant forcent les religieuses à effectuer cette concession.⁶³ On pourrait relever un certain nombre d'exemples analogues.⁶⁴

⁶⁰*Ibid.*, 462-4.

⁶¹Cf. Munro, *Seigniorial System in Canada*, 41-2.

⁶²"Arrêt du Roy qui ordonne que les terres dont les concessions ont été faites soient mises en culture et occupées par les habitants," 6 juillet 1711, *Edits et ordonnances*, I, 325.

⁶³*Edits, ordonnances, déclarations et arrêts relatifs à la tenure seigneuriale* (Québec, 1852), 72-5.

⁶⁴*Ibid.*, 63-6; 162-4.

Les arrêts de Marly ne fixent pas aux redevances un taux uniforme, comme le voulait Raudot en 1707, mais ils interdisent aux seigneurs d'exiger des censitaires plus qu'on ne paie dans la région où est située leur seigneurie. Pourtant, le point le plus important de cet arrêt est celui où le roi déclare que, dans un an, les seigneurs qui n'auront point de domaine défriché et qui n'auront point d'habitants perdront leurs fiefs.⁶⁵

Le second arrêt s'applique aux censitaires. Il y a des habitants qui, après s'être fait concéder un lopin de terre, négligent de le mettre en culture, ce qui déprécie les seigneuries et empêche les cultivateurs plus laborieux d'avoir accès au sol. Pour corriger cette situation, le roi décrète que, dans un an, les habitants verront réunies au domaine de leurs seigneurs les concessions qu'ils n'auront pas mises en valeur.⁶⁶

La portée de ces deux arrêts est considérable. Ils impriment un cachet particulier au système seigneurial canadien. Contrairement aux feudataires européens, maîtres absolus de leurs domaines, les seigneurs de la Nouvelle-France ne possèdent leurs fiefs qu'en fidéicommiss. Ici, le seigneur est un simple agent de colonisation. Qu'il néglige de remplir ses devoirs, aussitôt, il devient susceptible de se voir dépouiller de son titre et de son fief, "qui ne lui a été donné que pour le faire habiter."⁶⁷

Pendant que Louis XIV faisait publier les arrêts de Marly, l'ingénieur militaire Gédéon de Catalogne poursuivait son enquête sur les seigneuries de la Nouvelle-France. L'année suivante, son rapport atteignait Versailles. Il contenait des observations aussi exactes que décevantes. Ainsi, après la description de la seigneurie de Longueuil, où l'on pouvait suivre les efforts patients et fructueux du baron en vue d'améliorer son fief en même temps que le sort de ses censitaires,⁶⁸ on pouvait lire que les habitants de la seigneurie voisine de Tremblay étaient écrasés de redevances,⁶⁹ que les seigneuries du Richelieu, les plus belles peut-être du pays, végétaient⁷⁰ et qu'en général les propriétaires de fiefs avaient des exigences excessives.⁷¹ De tels faits expliquent la sévérité du jugement que le roi portait en 1714 sur le fonctionnement du système. "Sa Majesté, faisait-il écrire, a si bien connu le tort que les concessions de terres en justice ont fait à l'augmentation de la colonie qu'elle a absolument résolu de ne plus en accorder de cette Espèce . . . il n'y en a que trop, et il Seroit à Souhaiter que toutes les terres de la Nouvelle France fussent en roture. Elles en seroient bien mieux habitées."⁷²

Aussi, à partir de cette date, le gouvernement métropolitain s'oppose-t-il à la distribution de nouvelles concessions en fief.⁷³ Désormais cette règle ne souffrira pas d'exception. En 1718, Vaudreuil et Bégon se risquent à demander une concession à titre de fief et de seigneurie, avec haute, moyenne et basse justice, en faveur du capitaine Déjordy-Moreau; ils essuient un refus catégorique: "Le grand nombre de seigneuries, ex-

⁶⁵"Arrêt du Roi," 6 juillet 1711, *Edits et ordonnances*, I, 324.

⁶⁶"Arrêt du Roi qui déchoit; es habitants de la propriété des terres qui leur auront été concédées, s'ils ne les mettent en valeur en y tenant feu et lieu, dans un an et jour de la publication du dit Arrêt," 6 juillet 1711, *ibid.*, 326.

⁶⁷Mémoire du Roy à Vaudreuil et Bégon, 23 mai 1719, AC, B 41: 518v.

⁶⁸"Mémoire sur les plans des seigneuries," dans Munro (éd.), *Documents Relating to the Seigniorial Tenure*, 110.

⁶⁹*Ibid.*, 111. ⁷⁰*Ibid.*, 118. ⁷¹*Ibid.*, 146-7.

⁷²Mémoire du Roy à Vaudreuil et Bégon, 19 mars 1714, AC, B 36: 342.

⁷³Mémoire du Roy à Vaudreuil et Bégon, 15 juin 1716, AC, B 38: 229.

plique Versailles, n'a que trop préjudicié à l'Etablissement du Canada." ⁷⁴ Le roi "ne veut rien changer à l'ordre qu'il a donné de n'accorder que des terres en roture de trois arpents de front sur 40 de profondeur." ⁷⁵ En 1724, le gouvernement consent à donner une continuation de concession au propriétaire de la seigneurie de Sainte-Marie, mais il le fait à des conditions qu'il est intéressant de noter: le concessionnaire versera au domaine du Roi un cens annuel de 20 livres par lieue carrée; il pourra à son tour distribuer à des habitants cette terre, qui demeure propriété royale, moyennant une rente d'un sol et d'un chapon par arpent de front, sans pouvoir exiger davantage. ⁷⁶

La première infraction à cette règle se produisit en 1727, en faveur des Ursulines des Trois-Rivières, ⁷⁷ et la deuxième en 1729, en faveur du gouverneur de Beauharnais. ⁷⁸ En 1731, on s'aperçut que les anciennes seigneuries menaçaient de ne plus suffire au développement de la population; à partir de cette date, la métropole sembla se réconcilier avec le vieux système des concessions en fief et elle en distribua sans arrêt jusqu'à la conquête. ⁷⁹

Les abus signalés vingt ans auparavant n'avaient pas cessé. Dès 1717, Bégon accusait les seigneurs d'exploiter les censitaires, de les écraser d'exigences illégales en multipliant les corvées, et en se faisant verser une rente foncière pour l'usage des communaux. ⁸⁰ Certains refusaient aux tenanciers des continuations de terre en bois debout, vexation aussi tracassière qu'inutile. ⁸¹ C'est à qui eût inventé les prétextes les plus ingénieux pour vendre la terre au lieu de la concéder. ⁸² Cela est très remarquable et suffirait presque à prouver que le système des redevances profitait aux censitaires plus qu'aux seigneurs; autrement, on ne concevrait pas que ces derniers eussent pris tant de détours pour passer des contrats de vente plutôt que des contrats de concession. D'autres seigneurs s'y prenaient d'une façon différente pour augmenter leurs revenus. "Il est vrai en general, écrivaient à ce sujet Beauharnais et Hocquart, que les seigneurs concèdent les terres ou paraissent les concéder gratis, mais ceux qui éludent la disposition de l'arrêt du Conseil ont soin de s'en faire payer la valeur, sans en faire mention dans les contrats, ou d'en faire passer les obligations aux concessionnaires sous prétexte de sommes qui leur sont dues par ailleurs. . . ." ⁸³ D'autres encore se permettaient de pratiquer un trafic plus ou moins honnête des billets de concession. ⁸⁴

Comment remédier à ces abus? Le gouvernement métropolitain répondait: par l'application rigoureuse des arrêts de Marly. ⁸⁵ Une curieuse

⁷⁴Mémoire du Roy à Vaudreuil et Bégon, 23 mai 1719, AC, B 41: 517v.

⁷⁵Vaudreuil et Bégon au Conseil de Marine, 26 octobre 1719, APQ, Corr. de Vaudreuil, n.p.

⁷⁶"Mémoire du Roy pour servir d'Instruction au Sr Robert Intendant de Justice police et finances de la Nouvelle-France," 22 mai 1724, AC, B 47: 1149.

⁷⁷Munro, *Seigniorial System*, 47.

⁷⁸Conjointement avec Beaumont, Caron, *La Colonisation du Canada sous la domination française*, 61.

⁷⁹Munro, *Seigniorial System*, 47.

⁸⁰Bégon au Conseil de Marine, 5 mai 1717, dans Munro (éd.), *Documents Relating to the Seigniorial Tenure in Canada*, 153-7.

⁸¹Vaudreuil et Bégon au Conseil de Marine, 26 octobre 1719, APQ, Corr. de Vaudreuil, n.p.

⁸²Beauharnais et Hocquart à Maurepas, 10 octobre 1730, *Tenure seigneuriale, Correspondance, Pièces et documents, Rapports des commissaires*, s.l.n.d., iii.

⁸³*Ibid.*, iii-iv.

⁸⁴Beauharnais et Hocquart à Maurepas, 3 octobre 1731, *ibid.*, iv.

⁸⁵Mémoire du Roy à Vaudreuil et Bégon, 15 juin 1712, AC, B 34: 20.

conversation, échelonnée sur plusieurs années, s'engagea entre Québec et Versailles à ce propos. A maintes reprises, les dépêches métropolitaines insistent sur la nécessité de mettre résolument cette législation en vigueur, ajoutant qu'elle est "très nécessaire pour l'augmentation et l'Etablissement de la colonie."⁸⁶ Comme les administrateurs de la Nouvelle-France font la sourde oreille, le roi exige de l'intendant Bégon, en 1719, qu'il lui expédie un mémoire contenant la liste des seigneuries abolies en conséquence des arrêts de 1711.⁸⁷ Ne pouvant plus se dérober, l'intendant tâche de s'en tirer en alléguant que les seigneuries négligées n'ont pas été réunies au domaine du roi parce que personne ne s'est présenté avec le désir de s'y établir. "Cette reunion ne contribueroit en rien a l'établissement de la Colonie parce que les terres resteroient abandonnées."⁸⁸ Tel n'est pas l'avis du roi. Au contraire, fait-il répondre, il faut sévir contre les négligents parce que "les colons ne se presseront pas de faire les Etablissements auxquels ils sont obligez, tant qu'ils verront qu'on ne prive point de leurs concessions ceux qui n'ont point satisfait à leur obligation."⁸⁹ Il faudrait faire des exemples. Acculés au pied du mur, les administrateurs coloniaux agitent enfin la menace de révocation et font expédier des avertissements aux feudataires maladroits ou paresseux; c'est déjà quelque chose; mais quand se résoudront-ils à frapper?⁹⁰ Ils cherchent des excuses, trouvent de la bonne volonté aux seigneurs "Il leur paroist, répondent-ils, que la plus part des propriétaires de seigneuries ont fort à cœur de les établir, qu'ils font travailler a defricher leur domaine et que pour y attirer des habitans, ceux qui n'ont point de moulin a bled en font construire. . . ."⁹¹ Mais, en dépit des ordres du gouvernement royal,⁹² le gouverneur et l'intendant ne semblent pas pouvoir se résoudre à appliquer les sanctions prévues par les arrêts de Marly. En 1716, il est vrai, Vaudreuil et Bégon ont réuni au domaine du roi une concession appartenant à La Porte de Louvigny, major de Québec, mais il s'agit d'une lointaine seigneurie située dans l'Ile Saint-Jean.⁹³ Il faudra attendre la venue de l'intendant Hocquart avant d'être témoin d'autres initiatives semblables.

Fait significatif, Hocquart s'en prend d'abord aux censitaires. De 1727 à 1730, il se vente d'avoir révoqué plus de deux cents concessions en roture;⁹⁴ en 1732, il avouera avoir décrété plus de quatre cents réunions aux domaines des seigneurs.⁹⁵ Comme dit très bien Salone, "on est toujours plus sévère pour les petits que pour les grands."⁹⁶ Pourtant

⁸⁶Mémoire du Roy à Vaudreuil et Bégon, 26 juin 1717, AC, B 39: 232v-233.

⁸⁷Mémoire du Roy à Vaudreuil et Bégon, 23 mai 1719, AC, B 41: 518v-519.

⁸⁸Vaudreuil et Bégon au Conseil de Marine, 26 octobre 1719, APQ Corr. de Vaudreuil, n.p.

⁸⁹Mémoire du Roy à Vaudreuil et Bégon, 22 juin 1720, AC, B 42: 432v.

⁹⁰Mémoire du Roy à Vaudreuil et Bégon, 8 juin 1722, AC, B 45: 819.

⁹¹Vaudreuil et Bégon à Maurepas, 17 octobre 1722, AC, C 11A, 44: 138.

⁹²Maurepas à Dupuy, 8 mai 1727, AC, B 50: 517v.

⁹³Arrêt du 28 avril 1716, dans P.-G. Roy, *Inventaire des insinuations du Conseil Souverain de la Nouvelle-France* (Beauceville, 1921), 134-5.

⁹⁴Beauharnais et Hocquart à Maurepas, 3 octobre 1731, *Tenure seigneuriale, Correspondance, Pièces et documents, Rapports des commissaires*, v. Hocquart, poursuit le même document, "a cependant pris sur luy de donner un délai de 6 mois, ou d'un an, à ces concessionnaires pour leur oster tout sujet de plainte avant d'en venir à la réunion. Ce délai en a mis plusieurs en règle et les a engagé a établir leurs terres pour se mettre à couvert de la peine portée par l'arrêt du Conseil d'Etat du Roy du mois de juillet 1711."

⁹⁵Beauharnais et Hocquart à Maurepas, 1 octobre 1732, AC, C 11A, 57: 9.

⁹⁶Salone, *La Colonisation de la Nouvelle-France*, 361.

ceux-ci auront leur tour. Après avoir longtemps plaidé toutes sortes de circonstances atténuantes, les administrateurs du Canada se décident à sévir et, d'un seul coup, le 10 mai 1741, ils réunissent vingt seigneuries au domaine du roi, déclarant les concessionnaires "déchus de tous droits de propriété," sans égard à leurs représentations et sans leur ménager la moindre compensation.⁹⁷ Pour saisir toute la portée de cette mesure, il suffit de rappeler qu'elle entraînait la révocation de près d'un fief sur cinq. Une telle initiative n'avait cependant rien d'excessif. Elle venait à son heure. Elle eut l'excellent résultat de stimuler le reste des seigneurs qui, après 1741, semblèrent prendre plus clairement conscience de leurs devoirs.⁹⁸

De ce que nous avons vu que certains propriétaires de fiefs ne prenaient pas toujours leurs obligations au sérieux, il ne faudrait pas trop se hâter de conclure que tous les seigneurs étaient malhonnêtes, tracassiers ou négligents. Plusieurs n'étaient coupables que d'inexpérience; d'autres étaient trop pauvres, ce qui explique leurs exigences excessives à l'égard des censitaires—exigences, du reste, qui ne s'élevaient jamais à des sommes astronomiques et qui étaient loin de les enrichir.⁹⁹ Mais combien d'autres réussissaient brillamment à mettre sur pied des communautés agricoles aussi laborieuses que florissantes. Les seigneurs ecclésiastiques surtout obtenaient des succès signalés; il faut voir à la tâche les 2,000 censitaires des Jésuites, les 3,000 habitants des Sulpiciens, les 700 agriculteurs du Séminaire.¹⁰⁰ Voilà des groupes fort imposants. L'œuvre des seigneurs, en général assez lente, ne manque pas d'ampleur; les progrès de la colonisation nous l'ont révélée. En 1720, au moment où le métropole montrait le plus d'impatience à donner sur les doigts des feudataires, les administrateurs coloniaux crurent juste de rétablir les faits et de décrire les progrès de la conquête du sol.

Ils ne croient pas, déclaraient alors le gouverneur et l'intendant, qu'il y ait aucune Seigneurie dans l'intérieur de la Colonie qui ne soit Etablie; il y en a seulement quelques unes au dessus de l'Isle de Montreal que les propriétaires n'ont pas Etably parce qu'on les en a empesché autrefois pour ne point donner trop d'Etendue à la Colonie et que ces deffenses n'ont point encore Eté levées. Il y en a aussy quelques unes au bas du fleuve St-Laurent ou les propriétaires font faire la pesche sans y avoir d'Etablissement considerable. . . . Il est de leur connaissance que ceux qui ont des concessions peu établies se servent de tous les moyens qu'ils peuvent avoir de les augmenter, agissant en cela dans leur propre interest et afin d'en tirer quelque avantage, mais il est difficile que ces Etablissements se forment plus promptement par le peu de monde qu'il y a dans cette Colonie. . . .¹⁰¹

Retenons ces derniers mots. Ils donnent la raison de bien des échecs et des lenteurs les plus irritantes apportées au développement du pays. Pour le reste, faisons la part de l'exagération et notons l'évidente partialité des administrateurs à l'égard des seigneurs. Il reste quand même

⁹⁷"Jugement qui reunit au Domaine de Sa Majesté toutes les seigneuries qui ne sont point mises en valeur," 10 mai 1741, *Edits et ordonnances*, II, 555-61.

⁹⁸Cf. Munro, *Seigniorial System*, 50.

⁹⁹Cf. L. Groulx, *La Naissance d'une race* (Montréal, 1919), 212, 222.

¹⁰⁰*Recensements du Canada, 1870-1871*, IV, 48.

¹⁰¹Vaudreuil et Bégon au Conseil de Marine, 26 octobre 1720, APQ, Corr. de Vaudreuil, n.p.

que ceux-ci, malgré leurs défauts—des défauts qu'il convient d'attribuer aux hommes plutôt qu'au système—ont puissamment contribué à la mise en valeur de la vallée laurentienne; on reconnaîtra avec Rameau de Saint-Père que le régime féodal fut "le seul mode par lequel l'activité individuelle put suppléer à l'inaction royale" et qu'on "lui a dû une grande part du peu de bien qui s'est fait en ce pays."¹⁰²

¹⁰²E. Rameau, *La France aux colonies: Etudes sur le développement de la race français hors de l'Europe: Les Français en Amérique: Acadiens et Canadiens* (Paris, 1859), 2e partie, 65.

COLONIALISM AND NATIONALISM IN CANADIAN POETRY BEFORE CONFEDERATION

By A. J. M. SMITH
Michigan State College

I

"A national literature," wrote the Reverend Edward Hartley Dewart in 1864, in the Introduction to his *Selections from Canadian Poets*, "is an essential element in the formation of national character. It is not merely the record of a country's mental progress: it is the expression of its intellectual life, the bond of national unity, and the guide of national energy."¹ An ardent advocate of Confederation, the critic doubted whether a people could be "firmly united politically, without the subtle but powerful cement of a patriotic literature."² Such a literature, he felt, and particularly a poetic literature, would be a counterpoise to the sectionalism which was the political weakness of Canada. Dewart did not deny that such a literature was then only in its infancy and that it had many obstacles to overcome. Among these was a general absence of interest and faith in all indigenous literature that led him to the melancholy conclusion that "there is probably no country in the world, making equal pretensions to intelligence and progress, where the claims of native literature are so little felt, and where every effort in poetry has been met with so much coldness and indifference, as in Canada."³

The anthologist brought forward a number of reasons to account for this state of affairs. First was the obvious one that in Canada then, few people possessed wealth or leisure, while the large majority were engaged in the hard task of subduing the wilderness. But the most interesting of Dr. Dewart's reasons was the stifling effect of the colonial habit of mind.

Our colonial position, whatever may be its political advantages, is not favorable to the growth of an indigenous literature. Not only are our mental wants supplied by the brain of the Mother Country, under circumstances that utterly preclude competition; but the majority of persons of taste and education in Canada are emigrants from the Old Country, whose tenderest affections cling around the land they have left. The memory of the associations of youth, and of the honored names that have won distinction in every department of human activity, throws a charm around everything that comes from their native land, to which the productions of our young and unromantic country can put forth no claim.⁴

Here then at the beginning of Canadian literary criticism the issue is clearly stated. The value of independence is asserted, and the dangers of an imitative colonialism boldly faced.

Colonialism is a spirit that gratefully accepts a place of subordination, that looks elsewhere for its standards of excellence and is content to imitate with a modest and timid conservatism the products of a parent tradition. If we examine the poetry of the pioneer and emigrant in the days when the

¹*Selections from Canadian Poets; with Occasional Critical and Biographical Notes and an Introductory Essay on Canadian Poetry* (Montreal, 1864), ix.

²*Ibid.* ³*Ibid.*, x. ⁴*Ibid.*, xiv.

Canadian provinces were struggling for constitutional self-government, we shall find, I believe, that such colonialism reveals itself most surely in the abstract and conventional patriotic poetry, the ostensible subject of which might be devotion to the Empire—or even to Canada!—while true nationalism rises out of the local realism of the pioneer. Indeed, poetry that was colonial in its conventionality and correctness makes up the bulk of the verse in Dewart's anthology that was consecrated to the description of "Canadian" scenery and the expression of nationalist sentiment. This sort of poetry, certainly, comprises most of the verse on "Canadian" themes written by such poets as Mrs. Moodie, who belonged to the class of "persons of respectable connections" to whom, as she says, emigration was "an act of severe duty, performed at the expense of personal enjoyment." Such, too, was the poetry of the Maritimes, where a Tory gentry was anxious to create a little local autonomy that was colonial in its fervent imitation of England. *The Rising Village* of Goldsmith and the *Acadia* of Joseph Howe were also an expression of colonialism, though there are touches of realism in these poems and a sympathetic fidelity to nature; but the form, style, and technique, and the sensibility expressed are reflections of eighteenth-century England.

II

One of the most damaging of the results of pure colonialism is the feeling of inferiority and doubt it engenders and the remoteness it encourages. The colonial attitude of mind, as Professor E. K. Brown has well said, "sets the great good place not in its present, nor in its past nor in its future, but somewhere outside its own borders, somewhere beyond its possibilities."⁵ Thus a direct result of colonialism may be a turning away from the despised local present not towards the mother country but towards an exotic idealized crystallization of impossible hopes and "noble" dreams. The romantic spirit, indeed, is encouraged by a colonial sense of inferiority. This is illustrated by the preface to a book of poems by a New Brunswick author, Peter John Allan, which was published in London in 1853. The verse showed strong influences of Byron, Moore, and Shelley. "My lot," wrote the poet, "having been cast on the wrong side of the Atlantic in a colony where the Muse cannot find a resting place for the sole of her foot—in its very little capital, whose politics would be a mere private scandal to a European ear, and where society is strangely limited—can it be a matter of surprise that I should have sought for relaxation from more severe studies in the amiable foible of verse making?"⁶

To consider the realities of the life around him as too modest or too coarse for the attention of poetry is a temptation that faces the poet in a colony, particularly if he thinks of himself as an inheritor of the elaborate tradition of the poetry of the Motherland, and he makes poetry an escape from reality.

Mrs. Catherine Parr Traill, whose *Backwoods of Canada* (London, 1836) anticipated by some sixteen years her sister Mrs. Moodie's classic *Roughing It in the Bush*, agreed that Canada was not romantic enough to provide rich material for poetry, and she quotes with approval the "lamen-

⁵*On Canadian Poetry* (Toronto, 1943), 14.

⁶*The Poetical Remains of Peter John Allan, Esq., late of Fredericton, New Brunswick* Edited by the Rev. Henry Christmas (London, 1853), Preface by the Author, xx.

tation of a poet." "It is the most unpoetical of all lands," this person said; "there is no scope for imagination; here all is new—the very soil seems newly formed; there is no hoary ancient grandeur in these woods; no recollections of former deeds connected with the country."

This is an example of pure colonialism, before the slightest feeling of veneration for the new land had a chance to arise. Mrs. Traill complains that poetic feeling is quite alien to the sort of people who are likely to succeed in Canada: . . . "The class of people to whom this country is so admirably adapted are formed of the unlettered and industrious labourers and artisans. They feel no regret that the land they labour on has not been celebrated by the pen of the historian or the lay of the poet. . . . They would not spare the ancient oak from feelings of veneration, nor look upon it with regard for any thing but its use as timber. They have no time, even if they possessed the taste, to gaze abroad on the beauties of nature."⁸ We hear in these words the disillusioned voice of an English gentlewoman, the wife of a half-pay army officer, submitting to the painful drudgery of the unbroken wilderness. The English publisher of Mrs. Traill's book was able to take a more romantic view of things, and he wrote in the Introduction of a special compensation that the colony might afford the better-class settler's wife: "To the person who is capable of looking abroad into the beauties of nature, and adoring the Creator through his glorious works, are opened stores of unmixed pleasure, which will not permit her to be dull or unhappy in the loneliest part of our Western Wilderness."⁹

This latter opinion is the orthodox one. It was held by Dr. Dewart and others like the emigrant poet, Standish O'Grady, and the encyclopedist, Henry J. Morgan, whose testimony I have quoted elsewhere.¹⁰ The first person who arose with a sufficient command of language and feeling to treat what were felt to be the particularly "Canadian" aspects of scenery with the enthusiasm expected of a genuine romantic poet was Charles Sangster.

III

Sangster (1822-93) was born in Canada—in the Navy Yard at Kingston—and though he knew poverty he did not experience the hard lot of a pioneer settler. He became a journalist in Kingston, and later a civil servant in Ottawa. He published *The St. Lawrence and the Saguenay* in 1856 in Kingston and New York, and at once he was hailed as a national poet. "A Canadian Poet, whose poems are far above mediocrity—whose songs are of Canada—her mountains, maidens, manners, morals, lakes, rivers, valleys, seasons, woods, forests, and aborigines, her faith and hope"—so he was described by a contemporary reviewer.¹¹ Dr. Dewart proclaimed him first among native poets. "Many other Canadian poets," wrote the anthologist, "having spent their youth in some other land, though cherishing a strong regard for the country of their adoption, keep their tenderest affection for the land of their birth; selecting their principal imagery from its scenery and associations, somewhat to the neglect of the materials,

⁷Catherine P. Traill, *Backwoods of Canada* (London, 1836), 154.

⁸*Ibid.*

⁹*Ibid.*, Intro., 4.

¹⁰In *The Book of Canadian Poetry* (Chicago, 1943), 12-13.

¹¹In *McKenzie's Message*, quoted in "Opinions of the Press" at end of Sangster's *Hesperus and Other Poems and Lyrics* (Montreal and Kingston, 1860).

which nature so profusely lavishes on the scenery of this country. But Mr. S., while cherishing a loyal attachment to the mother land, gives Canada the chief place in his heart."¹²

Yet we cannot feel that Sangster succeeded in becoming a national poet; and the reason is, I believe, that he was not first a local poet. Romantic enthusiasm and literary polish kept his work vague and general. He was steeped in the romantic tradition of Byron and Shelley, and his diction and imagery were much less national than his early critics wished to think. It is true that he chose to describe Canadian scenery, but the sensibility that interpreted what he saw and the language in which he expressed his feeling were the common heritage of European romanticism. "His whole soul seems steeped in love and poesy," wrote another reviewer. "He is thoroughly sentimental, teeming with ideas of the sublime and beautiful. . . ."¹³ His diction and imagery are indistinguishable from those of a minor romantic poet in England or the United States, and he suggests comparison with Campbell, Moore, or Longfellow—occasionally with Byron, Shelley, or Tennyson. The real source of the enthusiasm with which Sangster was hailed as a national bard was pride in the fact that here was a poet who was *not* different from English poets but who was good enough to be named in the same company with some of the most firmly established of them.

This, I think, is the heart of the problem of nationalism in Canadian poetry (and in the other arts as well). Is a Canadian poet one who is indubitably a *poet* because he has, in sufficient strength, qualities which are recognizably the same in kind as those of the standard poets of the English tongue, and a *Canadian poet* because he happens to live and write in Canada, to use Canadian place-names, and to mention the flora and fauna of Canada? Or is he a poet as original and indigenous as Thoreau or Whitman?

I put these questions; and I shall not try to answer them here. I shall content myself with two remarks. The first is that Canada need feel no sense of humiliation that a poet who is Canadian as Whitman is American should not have arisen among us. America only produced one Whitman and one Thoreau. The rest of the American poets are no more and no less American than our poets are Canadian. My second observation is that we have called our poets (Carman and Roberts, if not Sangster) *national* because they were recognizably *poets*, judged by the standards of the accepted English masters, and then have pretended to ourselves that they were *Canadian*. The late Professor Cappon, of Queen's University, perhaps the best literary critic this country has produced, was right when he remarked in a passage I have quoted before but which is so important that it will bear repeating—"Perhaps our best Canadian poets have devoted themselves too much to an almost abstract form of nature poetry which has too little savour of the national life . . . and is more dependent on literary tradition than they seem to be aware of."¹⁴

IV

Professor Cappon's observation is as true of Sangster as it is of Roberts. But there were men in Canada whose closeness to the soil and the back-

¹²*Selections from Canadian Poets*, 150.

¹³In the *Huron Signal*, quoted in "Opinions of the Press" at end of *Hesperus*.

¹⁴J. Cappon, *Roberts and the Influences of his Time* (Toronto, 1905), 84.

breaking labour of clearing the wilderness kept them from acquiring the smoothness and glossy finish that was expected of the "serious" poet, and it was these, more than the literary poets, who prepared the way for the expression of a genuine nationalism. This they did by avoiding the abstract and grandiose, and concentrating with sympathetic insight upon the familiar and the local. The result was a poetry less poetic than Sangster's but native enough, and *tangy*—the necessary prelude to a realistic nationalism.

The best known of these poets was Alexander McLachlan, who came to Canada to escape the hard lot of a poor tailor's apprentice in Glasgow. He told the story of his voyage to Canada and the opening up of a pioneer settlement in the wilderness near Guelph in a spirited little epic called *The Emigrant* (published 1861). On the ship bound for Canada, one of the emigrants sings a song that states the feelings of McLachlan towards the country he is leaving. It has a humour and heartiness that suggest no one more certainly than Cobbet. The middle stanzas will show the radical independence and economic bias of McLachlan's thinking.

I love my own country and race,
Nor lightly I fled from them both,
Yet who would remain in a place
Where there's too many spoons for the broth.

The squire's preserving his game.
He says that God gave it to him,
And he'll banish the poor without shame,
For touching a feather or limb.

The Justice he feels very big,
And boasts what the law can secure,
But has two different laws in his wig,
Which he keeps for the rich and the poor.

The Bishop he preaches and prays,
And talks of a heavenly birth,
But somehow, for all that he says,
He grabs a good share of the earth.¹⁵

An equally spirited poem and one that gives a good picture of the agrarian distress that prompted the emigration can be found among the verses of a fellow-countryman of McLachlan, Alexander Glendinning. This author described himself on the title page of a volume simply called *Rhymes*, published in London, Ontario, in 1871, as "sometime in Eskdalemuir, Dumfriesshire, Scotland." He appears to have come out to Canada in the late thirties, via New York, and settled in Upper Canada, near Scarborough. Glendinning's name is not mentioned in any book on Canadian literature, but his work, homely and unpretentious in the extreme, has a directness and personal tang which give it a value that mere literary polish could never have imparted to it.

Glendinning tells of the hardships of "Annandale Farming" in a poem that united humour and social significance.¹⁶ The ills are a compost of

¹⁵*The Emigrant and Other Poems* (Toronto, 1861), 27-8.

¹⁶*Rhymes* (London, Ont., 1871), 72-4.

"dead sheep, daft bargains, a tea-drinking wife; Dull markets, partial payments, a long rent." His description of his stock is a fine bit of country realism—precise, disillusioned, and humorous:

Four or five horses, leaning 'gainst their stalls,
 Eight calvers, high of bone and hard of skin;
 Some forty porkers, making hideous squawls,
 Through lack of murphies, pitifully thin,
 With savage snouts they undermine the walls;
 Soon shall the half-rotten roof-tree tumble in
 And crack their rigbones, pound their hams and flitches,
 And put a finisher upon the wretches.

The poem continues with an ironic address to

Ye happy few, ye owners of the soil,
 Who feed upon the fat and drink the sweet,
 Just look and see how your poor tenants toil,
 And, after a', have hardly bread to eat;
 Let down your rents, live and let live the while,
 And we will be your servants, as 'tis meet;
 We'll gang and buy oursels new coats and breeks,
 And never speak a word on politicks.

Glendinning gives us an excellent account of his journey to Canada and of the opening up of a new home in the wilderness. He describes the discomforts of the ocean voyage in feeling terms. He was battered down with other "luckless wretches"

In a ship's hold and under hatches
 'Mang twa three hunder lowsie bitches,
 Brood of blue ruin!
 These, as the vessel rolls and pitches,
 'Cursin' and spuein'.¹⁷

Glendinning landed at New York and travelled in a steam boat up the Hudson to Albany. From there he journeyed westward by stage (rather than by Erie Canal) and crossed Lake Ontario to settle for a time at Scarborough. Then came the hardships, the new kind of back-breaking labour, the discouragements, and the loneliness. The years during which all these disadvantages are slowly overcome and a new feeling of pride and independence gained gave Glendinning the subjects of his spirited rhymes.

It is the same story we read in Mrs. Traill, Mrs. Moodie, and Alexander McLachlan, but the accents are harder, the tone richer and more realistic. The writer who is to make anything worthwhile out of this material has to face it squarely and look back on it (for often he cannot write about it at all until the worst of the preliminary work is over) not with the sentimental glance of the local colourist but with the strict eye of the realist. It is the chief claim to serious consideration of the Scottish emigrant poets that this is exactly what they did. They were colonial poets to the extent that they could not forget their sturdy and almost instinctive sense of hearty British rightness, but this, more often than not, made them independent, and resentful of interference from the mother country, and was indeed one of the most important elements in the Canadian national feeling that was rising among them. Indeed, it was just their vivid sense of the harsh neces-

¹⁷*Ibid.*, 46.

sities that confronted them in the wilderness and their close grip upon immediate realities that gave them the solid foundation upon which to build a new national pride. This developed when they had at last conquered their environment and established themselves in greater security and prosperity than they had known in the old country.

Sincerity, simplicity, and directness distinguish the verse of the best of the pioneer poets. They were not, most of them, distracted by any self-conscious literary awareness. They did respond to one literary influence—that of Burns: but this influence was on the side of reality, homeliness, good sense, and humour; it was not a distracting or sentimental one like that of Shelley or Byron, Poe or Tennyson, upon Sangster.

This poetry is full of realistic and vividly humorous pictures of life in the bush. Glendinning describes

A band o'loggers at a bee—
Smart chieles wi' handspakes working free
In shirt and breeches,
And teamsters, loud wi' ha and gee,
Twirling blue beeches.¹⁸

One of Glendinning's compatriots—Robert Boyd, who came to Upper Canada in 1830 from Ayreshire and died at Guelph in 1880, at the age of eighty-three—painted the hardships of a settler's life in a vivid descriptive poem called "The Bachelor in His Shanty."¹⁹ Here humour and realism are united in a characteristic manner. Why, he wonders, did he leave his native country and "freens of social glee"

To come to this strange land o' trees,
The vile abode o' frogs and fleas,
Wi' no ane near to sympathese,
Or yet to hate us;
Devour'd alive by slow degrees
By curs'd mosquitoes.

Roasted by summer's heat, frozen by the winter breeze, his sheep and lambs carried off by wolves, the poor shanty man tells of his other troubles—

A grumphy, too, I fed with care,
Till he might weigh Twal' stane or mair;
And when about to scrape his hair,
Though no' that able,
A muckle black and ugly bear
Saved me the trouble.

* * * *

A farmer too I'm called by name,
Nay—even a Laird—so much for fame,
Which makes me blush wi' burnin' shame
The truth to tell,
For a' my craps scarce fill my wame
And nane to sell.

Twa-three bits o' potato hills,
For stumps are sworn foes to drills,

¹⁸*Ibid.*, 52.

¹⁹In *Selections from Scottish-Canadian Poets . . . With an Introduction by Dr. Daniel Clark* (Toronto, 1900), 61-8.

Some pumpkins big as cadger's creels,
 Is a' my crop;
 For aught I raise, markets and mills
 Might a' gie up.

But the significance of the story that all unite in telling is that a real source of pride, at first local but later becoming national, grows out of the sense of accomplishment when the fruits of strenuous labour are made the foundation of independence, if not of wealth. "Canada, say what they will on't," declared Glendinning,—

There's mony a gude-gaun' busy mill in't,
 And weel-fill'd ark,
 And every man gets bread and yill in't
 That likes to wark.²⁰

And one of the finest passages in Isabella Valancy Crawford's masterpiece, "Malcolm's Katie," tells how the "axe-stirr'd waste" is filled with eager crowds—

Upheav'd by throbs of angry poverty,
 And driven by keen blasts of hunger, from
 Their native strands—

who found new vigour as they found new hope.

The lab'rer with train'd muscles, grim and grave,
 Look'd at the ground and wonder'd in his soul,
 What joyous anguish stirr'd his darken'd heart,
 At the mere look of the familiar soil,
 And found his answer in the words—"Mine own!"²¹

It was this independent spirit more than anything else that prompted, sustained, and rewarded the emigrant, and eventually motivated his patriotism. At first it may have been limited by colonial loyalties, but it eventually and almost inevitably became a national one. This can be traced in the verse of Alexander McLachlan, though McLachlan's background made him a little different. His youthful experiences as a poor weaver in Glasgow had given him the humanitarian and political tenets of the Chartist movement. He writes of the horrors of poverty in an industrial metropolis,

Where bloated luxury lies,
 And Want as she prowls the streets
 Looks on with her wolfish eyes,²²

and his verse is nowhere keener than in his description of the modern city with

Its palaces raised to gin,
 And its temples reared to God;
 Its cellars dark and dank,
 Where never a sunbeam falls,
 Amid faces lean and lank
 As the hungry-looking walls.²³

One of the liveliest of the sketches in McLachlan's *Lyrics* is a reminiscence of old country radicalism. It is called "The Glasgow Chap's Story; or,

²⁰Glendinning, *Rhymes*, 52.

²¹I. V. Crawford, *Old Spookses' Pass, Malcolm's Katie, and Other Poems* (Toronto, 1884), 51-2.

²²*The Emigrant*, 34.

²³*Ibid.*, 35.

Confessions Over a Bottle”²⁴ and describes a Chartist meeting with a clear-sighted irony that must not be mistaken for antipathy. The speech of “bloody Tom” is rendered with fidelity and humour:

Odd man! how nicely he set aff
The guid that’s in pair folk,
And o’ their rights and virtues lang
And tenderly he spoke.

* * * *

Says he, we a’ came naked here
The best get but a grave,
Then why should ane be made a lord,
Anither made a slave.

How ane should drive a coach and six,
While millions drive the shuttle,
How ane should waste while thousands want
Were questions rather kittle;
And thus he argued lang to prove
That things are ill divided,
Then put it to a show o’ hands
And it was soon decided.

Finally, catching the enthusiasm, the Glasgow chap jumped to his feet and essayed to make a speech. But his tongue and knees failed him, and in mortification at his lamentable exhibition he slunk away and emigrated to America.

McLachlan himself brought such ideas into Upper Canada. In his early poetry the prevailing note is one of radical idealism. A characteristic expression of it may be found in *The Emigrant*, Chapter IV, “Cutting the First Tree.” This describes the celebration at the end of the logging bee, during which one of the settlers addressed his “fellowmen.” The orator outlined a mythical age of gold, when “a simple honest race” lived in communal anarchy which recognized only the individual conscience as its law.

They gave power and place to no man,
And had everything in common;
No one said this is mine own—
Money was a thing unknown;
No lawgiver and no pelf,
Each a law was to himself. . . .²⁵

Peace and plenty blessed this innocent classless society. The contrast with the present is obvious—now

Every man is for himself . . .
Hunting for the root of evil,
Restless as the very devil—²⁶

and it provokes a passage of biting satire upon the hypocrisy and double dealing that leads to modern success. The modern gospel is “get cash if ye can come at it by fair means, but be sure and get it.” The moral of the

²⁴Alexander McLachlan, *Lyrics* (Toronto, 1858), 54-9.

²⁵*The Emigrant*, 48-9.

²⁶*Ibid.*, 49.

speech is Utopian co-operation. Let us unite to redeem the world from gold.

Each for all, and all for each,
Is the doctrine that I preach;
Mind the fable of the wands,
'Tis a fact that always stands;
Singly, we are poor and weak,
But united, who can break,²⁷

It was the hope of establishing in Canada a classless society, where energy and merit would be unhampered by the unfair competition of birth and privilege that inspired McLachlan with an independent national zeal. In one of his later poems, "Young Canada, or Jack's as Good as His Master,"²⁸ his patriotic enthusiasm is kindled for "The Land where Labour's free." "Rank and cast are of the past; They'll never flourish here," he exults, and praises the new aristocracy of labour, "the nobles of the forge and soil, With ne'er a pedigree."

McLachlan's patriotic poetry is sometimes both radical and national in tone. This can be seen in a little song called "The Genius of Canada" in the volume of 1858.²⁹ The Spirit speaks:

Though bleak the skies may be,
The maple dells
Where freedom dwells
Have a special charm for me.

She avows a determination to "rear a race to shed a grace On the mighty page of time." The arts shall flourish and the palm of peace shall wave over a home of rest for the oppressed; and if at the end of the poem the shamrock, rose, and thistle entwine in the land of lake and pine, at the beginning there is a clear indication of sympathy with the abolitionist cause of the north which was in sharp contrast with the attitude of the British Government. From the point of view of the mother country, indeed, Canada's apathy in the face of a possible attack from the United States as a result of Britain's encouragement of the Confederacy was one of the most distressing aspects of Canadian nationalism. McLachlan went so far as to write an "American War Ode" in which his republican radicalism found expression in a hymn that was neither Canadian nor imperialist.

The spirit of Washington
Stalks from the grave,
And calls on his children
Their country to save.

* * * *

Where backwoodsmen triumphed,
O'er tyrant and King;
There still the long rifle,
For freedom can ring.³⁰

But such ideas, we must remind ourselves, are exceptional, and even in McLachlan they were found along with others that were impeccably and

²⁷*Ibid.*, 51.

²⁸Alexander McLachlan, *Poems and Songs* (Toronto, 1888), 119.

²⁹*Lyrics*, 16-17.

³⁰*The Emigrant*, 234-5.

almost fulsomely loyal to Britain. The Crimean War, the birthday of the Queen, the visit of the Prince of Wales, the Fenian raids—these and like subjects inspired the Scottish emigrant poets as often, and about as effectively, as they did Sangster.

V

It would be unjust to deny, however, that the patriotic nationalism so earnestly fostered by Dr. Dewart—and by most of his successors among critics and anthologists—found expression in an occasional lyric of precision and power. Indeed, it would have been surprising if it had not; for that spirit was the one in which the political and economic life of the provinces was developing in the crucial years between 1840 and 1867, when the poetry we have been discussing was written. The causes are well known: they were long ago summarized by J. L. Morison. "With reciprocity had come prosperity; with prosperity had come independence, and a great increase in the number of the colonists. . . . Education in the energetic hands of Egerton Ryerson was playing its part; every addition to the travelling convenience of the provinces meant additional political cohesion. . . . The strong imperial note in John A. Macdonald's speeches bears witness to the popular movement by its underlying nationalism—it is Canada, no mean national unit, which begins to offer filial assistance to the mother country."³¹

This note is heard in the poetry of the times. It is sounded often in Dr. Dewart's anthology, but while it only rarely takes on an accent of power and beauty, it rang out clear and convincing in one or two lyrics before it later found classic expression in Roberts's "Canada." Sangster's "Brock" is one of these.

One voice, one people, one in heart
And soul, and feeling, and desire!³²

And in a stanza or two at least of the elegy which Charles Mair wrote on William A. Foster, the leading spirit of the "Canada First" movement—the note of conviction is sounded, if not held.

First feel throughout the throbbing land
A nation's pulse, a nation's pride—
The independent life—then stand
Erect, unbound, at Britain's side.³³

This is the sentiment that all the poets and versifiers express and return to. Nowhere does the idea of annexation or of independence find expression in our early poetry, but the ideal of Confederation and of a Canadian nationalism that will contribute strength to imperialism because of the free participation of a strong, self-reliant, and unified nation: that ideal we can watch growing in the quarter of a century before Confederation. But before this feeling could find adequate expression, it had to be nourished in the very earth of the new land. It is the pioneer realism and humour of the backwoods poets that show the solid base of experience out of which national pride and self-confidence alone could grow.

³¹*Canada and Its Provinces* (Toronto and Edinburgh, 1914), v, 79.

³²Sangster, *Hesperus*, 84.

³³*Tecumseh, A Drama and Canadian Poems* (collected edition, Toronto, 1926), 258.

DISCUSSION

Professor Bailey pointed out that the radical tradition in Canada before 1867 which was indicated in the paper was of great interest. Also the fact that there were expressions of nationalism before this date was significant. This is the first such paper read at the Canadian Historical Association. Canadian historians seeking elements of Canadianism have not sufficiently consulted literature. This is a fruitful field for investigation.

Professor Sage stated that the author of the paper ought to develop further his remarks about proletarian verse in Canada.

Professor Smith, in reply to a question about forms of poetry, said that changes in form are necessary to the advance of poetry. Though not as well written, this humble poetry, which he quoted in his paper, had a greater historical interest than the poetry of Carman and others like him.

Professor Lower affirmed that up to now Canadian literature had emerged from several "societies" not from "the whole Canadian society." At present there is an effort to reach towards the merging of these societies into a whole society. Perhaps Canada has to settle its political problems before there can be a national literature.

RELIGIOUS ORGANIZATION AND THE RISE OF THE CANADIAN NATION, 1850-85

By S. D. CLARK
University of Toronto

IN 1824 the Canada Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church was formed. In 1924 the United Church of Canada came into being. The story of Methodist development in Canada within this one-hundred year period appears at first glance to be very largely a story of successful efforts to bring about the independence of the church of outside controls, and the union within one body of the different Methodist groups in the country. That was particularly true of developments within the period from 1850 to 1885. In 1850 there were five distinct Methodist churches in Canada and only a few less in the Maritime Provinces, most of them owing some attachment to outside ecclesiastical bodies. By 1885 these various churches had become united within one self-governing religious denomination—the Methodist Church of Canada.

Developments within the other leading Protestant denominations were not unlike those which took place within Methodism. With them, also, the movement seemed to have been one of increasing union within the national community, and, again, this was particularly true of the period from 1850 to 1885. Though the Church of England faced no problem of disunity, except as related to the conflict between high church and evangelical elements, the need of identifying itself more closely with the Canadian national community led first to the organization of synods within the various dioceses, beginning in 1857, then to the organization of provincial synods, beginning in 1861, and eventually to the organization of a general synod for Canada in 1893. By means of these constitutional adjustments, the Church of England in Canada emerged in fact as well as in name. The achievements of Presbyterianism in the same period were even more spectacular. In 1844 there were eleven separate Presbyterian churches in Canada and the Maritime Provinces, many of them closely tied up with mother churches in Scotland. By 1875 these eleven churches had given way to the one self-governing national church—the Presbyterian Church in Canada. The development of the other Protestant denominations followed very much the same pattern. Lutherans, Baptists, and Disciples of Christ, to mention only the more important, moved steadily in the direction of a closer identification with the Canadian national community during the years from 1850 to 1885.

The conclusion, therefore, would seem to be that the period from 1850 to 1885 was one characterized by a growing national consciousness within all the churches in Canada, not excepting, indeed, the Roman Catholic Church. Religious bodies which had grown up in the country without any close relationship to the community in which they operated had come increasingly to identify themselves with that community in the form of the Canadian nation. The striking coincidences, within this period, in the development of religious, political, and economic organization appeared particularly to support the thesis that the movement in the direction of unity and national autonomy was a movement characteristic of all forms of association, including churches. Efforts of religious bodies to strengthen

denominational organization and means of self-government derived support from, and in turn provided support to, such efforts in the political and economic field.

The history of the larger denominations after 1885 seems to confirm the view that the development of religious organization has been closely related to the development of a united autonomous nation. The union of the Methodist, Presbyterian, and Congregational churches in 1924 might well be considered as simply another step in the direction of a complete uniting of religious forces—or, at least, of Protestant religious forces—within the national community. Strengthening of means of denominational co-operation has been accompanied by a weakening of doctrinal differences. The increasing social consciousness of the churches has led not only to a closer identification with the national community but to an increasing awareness of the fact that the differences within their teachings were of little significance in relation to their common interest in promoting the cause of Christianity. It is not very easy to determine today, from the character of the religious service, the denominational affiliation of the particular Protestant church one may find himself in. War and depression have emphasized the singleness of purpose of religious organization.

These facts have been well recognized, and their significance is not questioned here. The movement towards closer union within the national community has certainly been one of the striking characteristics of recent developments in religious organization in other countries as well as in Canada.¹ It may be questioned, however, whether this movement has proceeded in as unqualified a fashion as many church historians have assumed. The church historian has almost invariably been an historian associated with one of the large denominations; only such denominations can support schools of theology on a sufficiently high academic level to promote research in church history. The result is that a biased view of religious development has tended to prevail. Church history has been written very largely in terms of the history of those denominations which have attained a position of respectability in the community; only passing notice has been given to the role of religious movements operating on the social fringe of the community. This has been particularly true of church history in Canada. Developments of the past have been viewed in relationship to the position of the larger denominations of today; an evolutionary conception of growth has been accepted. The result, it is submitted, is a distorted picture. It would be no more unjustifiable to view religious developments in Canada as culminating in the rise of the Jehovah Witnesses, than it is to view such developments as culminating in the formation of the United Church of Canada. When religious developments in Canada are viewed as a whole, rather than as something relating simply to the larger denominations, a very different picture emerges. It becomes evident then that the movement within religious organization in the direction of a closer union within the community has almost invariably been accompanied by a movement in the opposite direction of division and separation from the community.

This was true of religious developments within Nova Scotia after 1760 with the growth of Protestant settlement and the establishment in the

¹Cf. H. Paul Douglas and E. deS. Brunner, *The Protestant Church as a Social Institution* (New York, 1935).

country of Protestant churches. Congregationalism, which was carried over from New England as a part of the social structure of the village community, shortly broke up into a number of divided churches in Nova Scotia as a result of the religious revival promoted by Henry Alline. The Newlight movement involved a disintegration of the ties of church and village and the organization of religion free of any entanglements with the community; the worldliness of the church gave way to the other-worldliness of the sect. Similarly, efforts of the Church of England to secure its position as the established church of the province received a sharp check with the rise of the Methodist movement under William Black which, like the Newlight movement, disavowed temporal ties of any sort. Newlightism and Methodism represented a break away from a traditional order of political patronage and social status and a re-assertion of the purely religious message of individual salvation. It was no accident that these movements grew up during the period of the American War of Independence and the migration of United Empire Loyalists. Revolution and migration imposed heavy strains upon both the political ties of Empire and the social ties of the local village. To a population cut off from the traditional controls of a secular society, the religious message of the evangelical sect provided a new basis for fellowship and belief.

By the end of the century, the Newlight and Methodist movements had become the dominant forces in the religious life of Nova Scotia and also of New Brunswick. Striking changes, however, by then had become apparent in the character of these movements. With the shift of the Newlights to a Baptist position and the organization of a Baptist Association in 1800, and with the break of the Methodists from American sectarianism and their tie with the English Wesleyan Conference in the same year, there emerged out of the earlier Newlight and Methodist evangelical sects the Baptist and Wesleyan Methodist churches closely associated with the political-social order of the community which they served. These developments are the sort seized upon by the church historian in support of the view that a movement towards union and autonomy has characterized the growth of churches in the country. The important fact is overlooked that the establishment of Baptist and Methodist denominational organization in 1800 was followed by the emergence of new evangelical sects—the Newlights as a religious group separate from the Baptists, the Freewill Baptists, the Scotch Baptists, Bible Christians, Primitive Methodists, Methodist Protestants, Campbellites, and others. Efforts of the Baptist and Methodist churches to identify their interests more closely with the interests of the community—evident, for instance, in the support given to the establishment of educational institutions and to temperance reform—led to a strengthening of their social position, but at the price of weakening their position of religious leadership among those masses of the population standing on the social fringe of the community. The growth of the timber trade and of trade with the West Indies, and the rise of the shipbuilding industry, brought new wealth to the Maritime Provinces and supported tendencies towards a sharpening of class divisions within the colonial society, but these developments also promoted increased mobility of population and the extension of settlement into areas of the country hitherto populated only by Indians and Acadian French. It was within these areas of change of population that the newer evangelical sects gained their chief support.

The Freewill Baptist movement grew very rapidly in western Nova Scotia and in New Brunswick, the Scotch Baptists and Bible Christians exerted their greatest influence in Prince Edward Island, while such sects as the Primitive Methodists were most active in the rapidly growing town of Saint John. The principle of the sect, of separation of the religious body from the community, persisted in the religious organization of the Maritime Provinces at least until well past the end of the first half of the nineteenth century. The reason is to be found in the persistence during this period of a condition where the opening up of new areas of social life offered challenges to a traditional order of social status in the community.

If attention is directed to Canada, much the same pattern is evident in the development of religious organization. The spread of Methodist and Baptist movements from the United States into Canada followed the rapid settlement of the country with the conclusion of the American War of Independence in 1783 and the Indian War in the West in 1795. The early Methodist and Baptist preachers, notwithstanding charges by spokesmen of the traditional churches that they were foreign agitators intent on promoting Republican ideas of government, were interested in only one thing—the salvation of individual souls. They interpreted their function as one which had nothing to do with the jurisdiction of states or philosophies of political parties. Thus they challenged the political privileges and claims of the Churches of England and Scotland, not by attacking these churches, but by withdrawing themselves from the community and promoting the establishment of an order of society on a purely spiritual basis. This character of the early Methodist movement needs to be emphasized in particular because of the tendency to associate the name of the politically-minded Egerton Ryerson so closely with its development, overlooking the fact that the movement had existed for over a quarter of a century in the country before the Ryerson brothers joined its ranks. During that earlier period of Methodist growth, the movement assumed very much the character of a religious sect.

The pamphlet written by Egerton Ryerson attacking the position taken by the Rev. John Strachan in promoting the cause of the Church of England represented a fundamental shift in the Methodist viewpoint. The Methodist and Baptist movements had grown out of the social situation of the backwoods community. With overseas immigration, particularly of people with wealth, and the growth of towns, strains within the organization of these evangelical sects became evident, and adjustment involved a strengthening of ties with the community. Union of the Canadian Methodists and English Wesleyans in 1832, which gave rise to the Wesleyan Methodist Church of Canada, involved an almost complete abandonment of the sect principle of separation from the secular world. The growing importance of the Methodist religious journal—the *Christian Guardian*—, and the increasing participation of Methodist leaders in politics, brought new sources of strength to the Methodist denomination, in the political and social order of the colony. Likewise, the tie of the Canadian Baptists with the English Baptists in 1837, and the organization of the Canada Baptist Union in 1843, resulted in a considerable weakening of the sect principle of otherworldliness and in a strengthening of the social supports of the Baptist denomination. It is not insignificant that the work of the Rev. Egerton Ryerson, the most prominent of the leaders within the Wesleyan Methodist

Church, was largely associated with the towns of Toronto and Kingston, while the work of the Rev. John Gilmour, equally prominent within the Canada Baptist Union, was largely associated with the towns of Montreal and Peterborough. The Methodist and Baptist churches oriented themselves increasingly about the new centres of social and political influence.

As in the Maritime Provinces, however, such tendencies towards a greater integration within the colonial structure were offset by tendencies towards religious division and withdrawal from the secular world. The union of Canadian Methodism and English Wesleyanism in 1832 was followed almost immediately by a break of a number of local preachers from the Canadian Conference and the organization of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Canada. At the same time, new Methodist sects entered the country—the Primitive Methodists in 1830, the Bible Christians in 1831, and the Methodist New Connexion in 1837. The Baptists were also faced with a problem of religious division and conflict. Organization of the Canada Baptist Union in 1843 led to schisms within a large number of the local churches and in the organization of the Regular Baptist Union of Canada in 1848 with membership confined to strict Baptist churches. The separation of the close communionists from the open communionists represented a break in Baptist ranks which reached much deeper than doctrinal differences; the intolerance of the close communionists was an intolerance of a religious sect which set itself solidly against the more worldly attitude of their open communion brethren. The multiplication in the number of Methodist and Baptist groups after 1830 was accompanied by the spread of new religious movements into the country. The Christian Church, Disciples of Christ, Irvingites, Mormons, Millerites, and Davidites were some of the religious sects which came to exert a considerable influence in Canada in the years from 1830 to 1850. The shift in religious organization back to the principle of the sect indicated very clearly that the conditions which had promoted the rise of the Methodist and Baptist movements in the first place had not disappeared. The extension of backwoods settlement, and the growth of public works, had the effect of throwing up new "social masses" made up of people who lacked status within the established social order of the community. Status was attained by such people within the religious order in the separation of the "elect" from the unsaved of the world, and in the substitution of spiritual for secular standards of social worth. Thus the movement within religious organization in the direction of a closer identification with the values of the outside world could be carried only so far. The sect principle in religious organization continued with the persistence of conditions of social disequilibrium.

After 1850, again, in spite of achievements in the way of church union, tendencies towards religious division were not completely absent. The Plymouth Brethren, Christadelphians, and a number of other sects made their appearance in Canada within the period 1850-85. Nevertheless, the view that the development of religious organization in this period was characterized by an increasing movement towards unity and autonomy is substantially correct. The explanation of such a movement, however, was not to be found in any general principle of evolution but rather in conditions which were peculiar to the social situation at that time. The kind of church unity which became established was the kind associated with a social system which had no further means of expansion. After 1850

Canada was left without any real frontier ; population movement was largely into the United States, to the rapidly growing industrial cities of the East and to the rapidly settling prairies of the West. What frontier areas Canada possessed, in her pioneer industrial towns stretched along the Grand Trunk Railway and in her government-sponsored agricultural settlements in Muskoka, had a population too small to support any significant movement of social or religious re-organization. Within the new mining towns of British Columbia, movements growing out of a condition of social unrest were not lacking, but the population of these mining towns was largely a male population which sought other than religious means of social expression. The emphasis in religious organization in Canada, as a result, was upon consolidation ; upon efforts to control the home market. Church union, like confederation or associations of economic groups, was a protective device. Religious enterprise could no more afford the wastes of competition than economic enterprise. Both found support in the strengthening of ties with the state. Sabbath observance laws, in the same way as tariffs, were means of enlisting the support of the state in meeting what was considered unfair competition. This alliance of the churches with the secular community in promoting the interests of a moral order was one which met with little challenge from religious bodies disavowing any connection with the secular community because of the absence of conditions disturbing to an established order of social status. The sect gave way almost entirely to the church, and the cause of national solidarity was furthered by the close identification of religious organization with the organization of the national community.

That condition came to an abrupt halt about 1885. Almost the very year which witnessed the union of the Methodist churches in Canada witnessed also the rise of the Holiness Church and Salvation Army. During the thirty years from 1885 to 1914, new evangelical movements grew very rapidly in the country ; abandoned Salvation Army temples in a great many small towns in Ontario today afford an idea of the strength of this religious body about 1900. In some of the larger cities, evangelical mission churches, without any denominational connection, made their appearance, and the size of their Sunday as well as week-day congregations attested to the declining influence of the traditional religious denominations. Efforts upon the part of the older churches to forestall the growth of the new evangelical sects were not lacking, in the establishment, for instance, of city missions, but these efforts for the most part were ineffectual. Among very large sections of the Canadian population after 1885—in the new and isolated prairie settlements and in the transitional areas of the growing cities—the evangelical sect crowded out the traditional church.

The instabilities of religious organization were closely related to the instabilities of the Canadian community structure after 1885. The opening of the West, the discovery of gold in the Yukon, and industrial growth in central Canada, led to new movements of population and to the emergence of social conditions unfavourable to an established order of social status. The rise of the Holiness Church and Salvation Army coincided with the completion of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The organization of mission churches and the spread of the Pentecostal movement into Canada took place during the years which witnessed the promotion of amalgamations in Canadian industry, and industrial concentration in strategic urban centres,

and the construction of two new transcontinental railways. The evangelical preaching of the Rev. P. W. Philpott in Hamilton in the early years of the present century was a social phenomenon not unrelated to the establishment by American manufacturing enterprises of branch plants in the country. Growth of population, and increasing population mobility, reflected the expansion of economic life and, in turn, were reflected in the growth in variety of religious sects. The "closed frontier" of 1850-85 which restricted the development of new religious movements gave way to the "open frontier" of 1885-1914 which promoted the break-down of the established religious order and the emergence of new religious divisions.

Developments in religious organization since 1914 have taken place too near in time to be clearly discerned, but certain tendencies seem evident. Those evangelical religious movements which took their rise within the period 1885-1914 have moved steadily in the direction of a greater accommodation with the community in which they operate. That tendency is very obvious in the case of the Salvation Army. In spite of the controls of headquarters, the Army in Canada has become very much a Canadian Army, while, at the same time, social pressures have led to a shift away from the position of the religious sect; the Army has assumed increasingly the character of a social service agency. Such a development has not been unrelated to developments taking place within the older religious denominations; the increasing emphasis upon social service activities among them also has been evident in the emergence of the institutional church with its imposing buildings housing swimming pools, gymnasias, and facilities for club meetings and with its elaborate administrative organization. The humble origin of the Salvation Army may still be reflected in the social standing of the majority of its following, but an increasing number of wealthy patrons indicates a move in the direction of increased respectability. The other evangelical sects which took their rise before 1914 have been faced with much the same sort of problems of adjustment though social accommodation has not gone quite as far as in the case of the Salvation Army. The organization in 1919 of the Pentecostal Assemblies of Canada is significant as indicating an effort to relate the Pentecostal movement more closely to the Canadian national community. Further investigation would probably reveal that this change has been accompanied by fundamental changes in the social basis of the movement.

Yet a glance at recent developments in religious organization in Canada is sufficient to dispel any notion that there is at present an uninterrupted movement towards religious union and closer identification with the national community. Organization of the Pentecostal Assemblies of Canada was followed by religious schisms which have given rise to a number of new Pentecostal sects under different names. Union of the Methodist, Presbyterian, and Congregational churches not only left in its wake a continuing Presbyterian Church more fundamentalist than the old, but a great number of unused church buildings which have been taken up by various evangelical sects or by free-lance evangelical preachers. In Alberta, union was followed by the almost complete break-down of denominationalism with the rise of the Social Credit movement. It is not sufficient to answer that these new religious movements are mere ripples in the religious current which do not affect the direction of flow of the main stream; the break of Luther from the Church of Rome or of Wesley from the Church of England might

likewise have been viewed by contemporaries as a mere ripple in the religious current. The new evangelical sects in Canada have grown out of social disturbances related to recent developments in the community. The strength of these sects in northern Alberta and Saskatchewan, in the mining towns of northern Ontario, and in the newer industrial communities of central Canada and the West suggests the close relationship between their rise and the emergence of new "social masses" on the fringe of the social order.

From this it would seem apparent that developments in religious organization in Canada today are following along lines very similar to those which have been followed in the past. Throughout, a movement towards a strengthening of the ties of church and community has been accompanied by a movement in the opposite direction of a separation of the religious from the secular order. Such a development was inevitable in the very nature of the religious institution.² The religious sect, the moment it was organized, came to be made up of people holding office, and the prestige attached to such office was determined very largely by the social position of the religious body in the community. Salaries could be paid, and large church edifices constructed, only if financial contributions could be secured from the wealthy or, at least, from the well-to-do. Thus, inevitably, the religious sect came increasingly to accommodate itself to the secular order. Secular values permeated its teachings; the energies of its leaders were directed into channels of community endeavour. The result was, in the end, that the status system of the religious order came to coincide with the status system of the social order. The religious sect passed from being a sect to become a church.

In doing so, it did not cease to perform its religious function, but it did cease to perform the social function of providing leadership to those foot-loose elements of the population which had no recognized place within the established social order. The person, for instance, of rural background who found himself in the rapidly growing city was essentially a person cut adrift from society. His integration into the new society could be brought about only through a re-definition of standards of social worth. Such a re-definition could be secured in the fellowship of the saloon where worth was measured in terms of the tippler's capacity to consume. It was secured very effectively in the fellowship of the religious sect where worth was associated with the convert's degree of spirituality. The insistence on the part of the sect that it was not of the temporal world derived not from any peculiarity of religious doctrine but simply from its peculiar social function. It separated itself from the traditional social order in erecting a new social order in which status was given a spiritual basis. Thus the other-worldliness of the sect sprang from social pressures which were as insistent as the pressures which determined the worldliness of the church.³

The effect of social influences tending towards sectarianism has been strikingly evident in the development of Protestantism in Canada. Whether it has been equally evident in the development of Roman Catholicism is a question not considered in this paper because of lack of familiarity with all the facts involved. It may be suggested, however, that the differences

²Cf. Ernest Troeltsch, *The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches*, translated by Olive Wyon (London, 1931), 2 vols.

³Cf. H. R. Niebuhr, *The Social Sources of Denominationalism* (New York, 1929).

in the development of Protestantism and Roman Catholicism are more apparent than real. In French Canada after 1760, the Roman Catholic Church developed within a closed social system, and there were as a result few pressures of a kind which threatened the close tie between church and community. Where those pressures have arisen, the Church has sought adjustment through an extension of its system of religious orders; the new religious order assumed very much the character of the new religious sect. Thus within Roman Catholicism, as within Protestantism, there has been a shifting away from, as well as a shifting towards, a worldly position in the community, the only difference being that in the case of Roman Catholicism it has usually taken place within the framework of the Church. That, however, has not invariably been the case. There have not been lacking in Canada reformation movements not greatly different from the Protestant Reformation in Europe in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. It is only necessary here to call attention to the recent schism within the Ukrainian Catholic Church in Canada. Other less spectacular, but no less significant, examples could be found. Furthermore, there has probably been a greater shift of Roman Catholics to Protestant religious sects than is generally realized.

One difference has to be recognized between the development of Roman Catholicism and Protestantism. The Roman Catholic Church has been able to a greater degree to check or control movements of its adherents into new areas of development, and in Roman Catholic communities there has been less as a result of that unrestricted type of development, associated with frontier movements of population. This fact, however, provides no reason for qualifying the thesis set forth in this paper. To the extent that a closed social system obtained, regardless of the nature of the forces which promoted such a condition, the full identification of religious organization with the community was possible. Consequently, where a church was able to control effectively a social system in the way of preventing any development unfavourable to its position, conditions were established which stifled the free operation of processes of social expansion.

This is simply another way of saying that religious systems are dynamic only so long as social systems are. There is no intention in this paper to suggest that tendencies towards division and sectarianism are at all times characteristic of religious development. Such tendencies obviously are not characteristic of religious development in isolated primitive societies nor were they of religious development under feudalism. In a primitive society the conditions of a closed social system are maintained through the heavy weight of what Bagehot called the "cake of custom," and in feudal society they were maintained through the authoritarian controls of a rigid institutional order. Furthermore, for very much the same reasons, a tendency towards division and sectarianism has been less evident in the religious development of Canada than of the United States. Forces of expansion in American national life have been a great deal stronger than such forces in Canadian national life; the American frontier developed unchecked by political and cultural influences of traditional authority which operated so powerfully within the Canadian frontier.⁴ The result has been that established religious systems have found even less support within the social

⁴Cf. Peter G. Mode, *The Frontier Spirit in American Christianity* (New York, 1923).

order. Union of churches and their identification with the national community have proceeded much more slowly than in Canada; division and separation of religious organization from the community have assumed a great deal more prominence. Religious sectarianism, indeed, had its principles written into the formal constitution of the Republic!

These considerations suggest that the sectarian religious movements with which we are familiar have been movements closely related to the commercial and industrial expansion of the western world during the past three or four centuries. It is true, of course, that very similar movements emerged much earlier in the development of Christianity and were particularly evident during the eleventh and twelfth centuries,⁵ but there was a period in between, associated with the high-water mark in feudal development, when a condition of stability in religious organization tended to prevail. It was with the break-down of the feudal order that there were unleashed forces of expansion in economic and social life which resulted in an upsetting of established religious systems. The conflict which emerged, centred about the issue of church and state, was very largely a conflict between the church and sect ideas of religious organization, and, as such, it was not essentially different from the conflict in religious organization in more recent times, even though what has been known as the state church has ceased to exist. The long struggle of the Baptists, for instance, to free religion from the control of the state was simply an expression of the sect principle that the spiritual and temporal belonged to separate worlds. The struggle in this instance took the form of challenging vested interests of land and office because the church which was attacked was a church which clung to feudal types of relationship within the community. When attention is directed to the efforts of Pentecostal sects in Canada to purify religious teachings, the point of attack is not greatly different; it is the relationship of the church to the community which is challenged. That relationship, over the years, has changed somewhat in character—financial contributions from wealthy citizens (many of them, in fact, not belonging to the church to which they contribute), and propaganda and lobbying, have taken the place of grants of public land and prerogatives of public office—but it still rests upon a body of vested interests in the community.

With the rise of nationalism in the western world, the identification of the church with the community has come very largely to be an identification with that particular form of community which is known as the nation. One of the fullest expressions of such identification is to be found in one of our own churches, the United Church of Canada, but this tendency has been characteristic of the development of religious organization generally. Even churches which have claimed to be universal have found it necessary to exploit national sentiment in the interests of solidarity. It is not without reason, therefore, that considerable emphasis has been placed by church historians upon the close relationship between religious and nationalist movements. What is so often overlooked, however, is the fact that nation-building, like empire-building, involved a very considerable upsetting of traditional social relationships; nationalism was closely associated with rapid economic expansion in terms of metropolitan centres and free enterprise, and the folk cultures of the local community disintegrated in face of

⁵Cf. Troeltsch, *Social Teaching of the Christian Churches*.

the intrusion of the pecuniary conventions of the national community. Thus tendencies in religious organization towards a closer identification with the national community resulting from the rise of nationalism have been offset by tendencies towards religious division growing out of conditions of social disequilibrium produced by economic expansion through free enterprise. National unity in the past has depended upon the operation of forces making for disunity as well as unity in the social structure of the community.⁶

It may be that movements of sectarianism will be much less evident in the future development of religious organization. Nationalism in recent years has come increasingly to depend upon the control of economic enterprise, and the nation-state, like the earlier feudal-state, may very well succeed as a result in erecting about itself a closed social system. The almost complete identification of religious organization with the nation under such circumstances would be inevitable. Economic forces which check any easy rise in the individual's social position in the community lend support to a movement in the direction of a rigid organization of religious life. Thus, while many Methodists and Baptists in Canada in the nineteenth century became rich and the change in their social status carried with it changes in the social position of the churches to which they belonged, the Jehovah Witnesses and Four Square Gospellers of today may remain forever poor with the result that the religious sect of today may be the religious sect of tomorrow. If that should be the case the stratifications within the religious structure would assume much more of a feudal character. Present religious divisions would be perpetuated, and the historic role of the religious sect in forcing adjustment within religious organization would be brought to an end.

The very existence, indeed, of the religious sect would be jeopardized in face of the powerful combination of church and state. The legal ban placed upon the Jehovah Witnesses in Canada may be considered an act justified in terms of the present crisis, but it has a significance which reaches far beyond the problem growing out of the situation produced by war. There is much in the character of the Jehovah Witnesses which is a painful reminder of the Anabaptist sects in Europe at the time of the Protestant Reformation. Religious sects by their very nature are at war with society, but where conditions are such that eventual accommodation is possible, this act of war assumes the form of a withdrawal into a spiritual world.⁷ Where, however, eventual accommodation is denied, the sect's reaction may be one of militant aggressiveness in an effort to make over society to its liking. Thus a strengthening of the ties of church and community through the support of the state results almost inevitably in forcing deviant religious movements into a revolutionary position, and the acceptance of such a position brings about in the end their extinction through the action of the state. Out of such a development state and church would emerge as one.

⁶Cf. Harold A. Innis, "Political Economy in the Modern State" (*Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, LXXXVII, no. 4, January, 1944, 336-7).

⁷Troeltsch, *Social Teaching of the Christian Churches*.

DISCUSSION

Professor Rothney protested that it was probably not because of a closed social system that no sects had developed in French Canada but because the Roman Catholic Church was a symbol of a minority cultural group and a means of cultural survival. He suggested that conflict between the English and Scottish established churches had helped to prevent the establishment of a state church in Canada. He thought that growing nationalism in Canada is having an effect upon religious development. New sects based on Britain, the United States, or elsewhere, are less likely to appear and cause strife as we become more Canadian and think less of other countries as our homelands. They become increasingly in danger of being accused of disloyalty to the state. "Continuing Presbyterians," he suggested, were nothing new but only a conservative force which had refused to move. They were hardly a new "sect."

Mr. Reid stated that the break in the Presbyterian ranks in the 1840's was not the result of the Scottish issue but a conflict between evangelicism and moderatism. He objected to Professor Clark's exclusive emphasis upon social background and aspects. This may be all right for sociologists but such a presentation can hardly be called a fair treatment of the subject as it neglects the purely religious aspect which is of prime importance. The case of the founding of the new Wesleyan Methodist Church, for example, was certainly not a matter of class stratification as both rich and poor participated in it.

Professor Saunders stated that the author appeared to say that religious sects arise when groups appear that do not fit into the existing social organization, and that such sects are either protests against or escapes from existing conditions; that, consequently, "another world" is emphasized by these sects, because in such a framework the non-fitters can create an artificial social status for themselves more to their liking. But if in time they manage to rise in importance and social position in this world, then they set about creating a co-ordination between their religious position and their new social position. Since they now "fit," the other worldly emphasis disappears in such co-ordination and gives way to a new "worldly" emphasis upon community and social services. If the society becomes a "closed society" the linking of state and church becomes inevitable. At present, there is in Canada a tendency towards a co-ordination of churches and the nation-state.

It appears thus to be the author's opinion that religious beliefs, religions in fact, are merely aspects of social conditions, created by men for ephemeral social purposes alone, i.e., as props for the *status quo*, as protests or escapes from existing conditions, and so have no permanent reality, or, indeed, any intrinsic validity. This seems a one-sided and untenable view, concluded Professor Saunders.

Professor Adair stated that Christianity has resulted in various alterations in society, and has itself been affected by social changes but these reciprocal influences do not involve any challenge to religious beliefs. The previous speaker, he contended, has not deduced the right ideas from the paper.

Professor Lower felt the line of investigation used in the paper to be a fruitful one. He suggested a study of the connection between people's places of origin, ideas of religion, and politics. Such studies, he suggested, would reveal much about both individuals and communities and their likely reactions to any given set of circumstances.

LIBERALISM IN CRISIS

By H. N. FIELDHOUSE

University of Manitoba

MAY I say three prefatory sentences about the purpose of this paper? When the invitation to discuss this topic came to me, I should have liked to think that it owed something to my public doubts about Liberalism and my private attachment to liberalism, but I suspected that it owed more to the discussion which followed a paper of two years ago, a discussion in which I touched upon the differences between Liberalism in the English-speaking, and Liberalism in the Latin, world. As this paper is only one of two tonight, I thought that it might be useful if I were to emphasize those aspects of the topic which have received relatively little attention here. I hope, however, that it will appear that "difference" is not "irrelevance"—that because Liberalism with us is not the same thing as Liberalism elsewhere, it does not follow that the collapse of Liberalism elsewhere is *irrelevant* to the crisis of Liberalism among ourselves.

A paper on Liberalism in crisis may begin with a definition of liberalism and a statement of the sense in which liberalism, so defined, is in crisis. In its original English home, liberalism had many sources, chiefly—as I argued before the Historical Association two years ago—aristocratic constitutionalism and religious independency; but in our contemporary world, liberalism is not exclusively English and can hardly be identified with any one of its sources. A genetic approach to it might suggest that it is derived from the idea and institution of property; and we are all familiar with the school which sees it as having been merely the political expression of economic *laissez-faire*, and of the interests of the capitalist *bourgeoisie*. I do not wish to discuss this view at the moment except to notice that it seems to enjoy a greater vogue in North America than in England.¹ Even when we have finished pushing back the beginnings of the industrial revolution to the Renaissance, and the beginnings of the Renaissance to the twelfth century, the fact remains that both our parliaments and our civil rights, in the English-speaking world, are older than anything which can usefully be called modern industrialism or economic *laissez-faire*.

In any case, I suggest that, in the liberal view, the idea of property is itself a deduction from the more fundamental idea of the individual; the idea that "the end of man . . . is the highest and most harmonious development of his powers to a complete and consistent whole" and that for this there are two requisites, "freedom, and variety of situations."² This, I take it, has been the classic core of liberalism, and, lest collectivists should scent a defence of *laissez-faire*, I would add that most liberals today would agree with T. H. Green that this does not mean that individuals are free "to do as we like irrespectively of what it is that we like," and that the law

¹For example, in Dr. Becker's *Modern Democracy* (New York, 1941). The more typically English view that "the union of Liberalism with *laissez-faire* was a coincidence in time rather than a congruity in spirit," will be found in Dr. E. Barker's *Reflections on Government* (Oxford, 1942), 186-94.

²J. S. Mill, *On Liberty* (1859).

should "put rather more than less restriction on those liberties of the individual which are a social nuisance."³

I shall use liberalism, then, to cover broadly that attitude of mind which holds "that a society must not be so unified as to abolish vital and valuable differences, nor so extravagantly diversified as to make an intelligently co-ordinated and civilized social life impossible, and that the imposition of a universal plan of life on a society is at once stupid and immoral."⁴

The obvious antithesis of liberalism, so defined, is totalitarianism, and the genesis of totalitarianism has been described as follows⁵:—mediaeval society was made up of a number of interlocking but autonomous "orders"—religious, political, cultural, and economic—with the spiritual order enjoying a primacy, in theory at least, in that the spiritual purpose of life was held to be paramount, and the spiritual order, therefore, to transcend and subsume all others. For the last six centuries, this unity has been steadily dissolving. With the Renaissance, secular culture escaped from the control of one historic organization, the Church, and created an independent order of humanist knowledge; and with the commercial revolution, economic activities escaped from the control of the other historic organization, the State, and created what, roughly, we call the capitalist order. These two independent orders—the freedom of secular enquiry and the techniques of modern capitalism—have largely determined the character of our modern civilization and have enormously increased its resources; but they have also acted as disintegrating forces, and the attempt to re-impose unity on society (by giving to the political order the same sort of primacy which, in the mediaeval period, was enjoyed by the spiritual order) is the thing which we call totalitarianism.⁶

I

If we have defined liberalism and totalitarianism correctly, then two things follow: first, that liberalism is something other than democracy, and

³*Works of T. H. Green* (London, 1908), III, 372. "Freedom . . . of doing what one will with one's own is valuable only as a means to . . . the liberation of the powers of all men equally for contributions to a common good. No one has a right to do what he will with his own in such a way as to contravene this end. It is only through the guarantee which society gives him that he has property at all. . . . This is the true and the only justification of the rights of property."

⁴M. Oakeshott, *The Social and Political Doctrines of Contemporary Europe* (Cambridge, 1939), xix.

⁵Christopher Dawson, *Beyond Politics* (New York, 1939), chap. I.

⁶This has been the more obvious in the sphere of economics because the attempt to bring the economic order under the control of the community has meant an attempt to extend political control to all aspects of social life; but a similar process has been at work in the field of culture. When the Humanists threw off the control of the Church, they did not reject the mediaeval idea of the freedom of the spiritual power. They simply applied that idea to the freedom of scholarship as directed to the investigation of the natural order . . . i.e., to the world of art and science—and they asked of the devotees of that freedom, a discipline at least as arduous as that of the devotees of the Church. With the growth of popular education at one end of the scale, and of scientific specialization at the other, the unity of the intellectual order has disappeared, to be replaced by the power of the State in popular education, the power of the press, and the world of the intelligentsia. The totalitarian régimes have tried to reimpose unity by the simple—and to us, distasteful—device of denying any autonomy to the intellectual order, and making all men's mental activities subserve the one purpose of a social consolidation imposed from above. Cf. Ortega y Gasset, *The Revolt of the Masses* (London, 1932), chap. XII.

totalitarianism something other than dictatorship; secondly, that if totalitarianism is an attempt to cure certain evils which are said to have sprung from liberalism, then a study of totalitarianism should point us to those weaknesses of liberalism which make the totalitarian remedy seem either necessary or plausible.

It is important to distinguish the issue of liberalism versus totalitarianism from that of democracy versus dictatorship, because I take it that we, in the English-speaking world, are concerned with the question: "Can it happen here?"; and I suggest that if the contemporary régimes which most obviously embody the threat to liberalism are to be treated on the political level, merely as dictatorships, then a study of them has little relevance for us.

Each of the contemporary dictatorships is explicable in terms of national experience, and that experience is not ours. The Bolshevik dictatorship was set up in a Russia in which every great ruler had been a Bolshevik, in the sense that, from time to time, some megalomaniac autocrat had taken the upper layer of Russian society and pushed it violently towards the West in the recurrent attempt to redress Russia's backwardness. The National Socialist dictatorship was set up in a Germany with an authoritarian tradition, a Germany accustomed to identify the State with the Army, and a Germany in which the idea of the "Volksgemeinschaft"—of a Community far transcending the mere juridical form of the State—has a long history. In the same way, we need not take too tragically, I think, the collapse of a particular set of liberal institutions—parliamentary institutions—in countries in which after all (and as has been said by someone—for here I am a picker-up of a half-remembered trifle) those institutions were never much more than copies of an English model in a dubious French translation.⁷

If, on the other hand, the great anti-liberal régimes are regarded as totalitarian communities, facing the same elements of social disintegration as those which confront us, and attempting to re-introduce, through the political window, the transcendent unity which, at the end of the Middle Ages, was expelled through the spiritual door, then it is another matter—a matter in which talk of either democracy or dictatorship is beside the point. The forces which are making for totalitarianism are common to all modern societies which are highly industrialized, and a democracy may be as totalitarian as any other form of polity. It was under the guise of democracy, indeed, in the French Revolution, that totalitarianism first made its appearance. The great safeguard of our liberal freedoms in the English-speaking world has been the pluralistic character of our society.⁸

⁷Just as Mr. Gladstone did not always understand that all those who admired his eloquence did not necessarily agree with him, so Liberals were prone to think that they had captured Europe when they had only dazzled it. They forgot that there are peoples who appear to find their best energies under authority, and others among whom the franchise is an addition to things for sale. Dr. Becker (*Modern Democracy*, 14-15) and Dr. Barker (*Reflections on Government*, part I, chap. II) have both recently restated the material and spiritual assumptions which underly the successful working of liberal democracy. They are large assumptions, and, had we remembered them, we should not, perhaps, have been too surprised that they have not been easily—and everywhere—fulfilled.

⁸"All simple forms of government," said Canning, "are bad." The spirit of England was "a spirit of corporation. Cities, parishes, townships, guilds, professions, trades and callings . . . and the pervading principle of the whole is that of vicinage or neighbourhood."

Replace this pluralism by a collective order, and the results, though democratic, may be no less totalitarian—though, we should hope, less police-ridden—than Bolshevism or Nazism.

I may be dispensed, perhaps, from rehearsing the confusion which arises from our English-speaking habit of identifying liberalism with democracy, because I have dealt with it elsewhere;⁹ but I should like to emphasize the point that because this confusion leads us to mistake the nature of the great anti-liberal régimes, it leads us also to mistake the points in which those régimes differ from ourselves, and so to mistake the peculiar sources of our own strength.

When eighteenth-century liberals spoke of British freedom, they meant *civil* liberties—freedom from arbitrary arrest, freedom of speech, freedom of worship and association—the liberties which are essential to the Liberal State. They did not mean *political* liberty, the franchise, the democratic state. But because, in our English-speaking world, there was as yet no incompatibility between liberalism and democracy, liberals were able to rear their nineteenth-century structure of political democracy upon the already assured basis of their older civil liberties, and to assume—as did Mill, and as does Dr. Lindsay¹⁰—that the first is an essential extension, and even a guarantee, of the second. Today, we are confronted by popular dictators who get into power by using all the apparatus of political democracy—mass plebiscites and popularly elected assemblies—and then use the power so obtained, to destroy the essential guarantees of *civil* liberty;¹¹ and confronted by this phenomenon, liberals have found the flanks of their defences turned, and their weapons pointing in the wrong direction.¹²

Secondly, to identify liberalism with democracy is to make an assumption which has been largely true of the English-speaking world, but which has been so radically false for other countries that, again, we are likely to lose ourselves in an international smoke screen and to minimize differences which—I shall argue—are important.

Liberalism, in the English-speaking world, developed out of the defence of individual liberties and class franchises *against* the State; whereas Continental democracy began as the *assertion* of the State, unified according to Rousseau's doctrine of the General Will, *against* class privilege.¹³ Democracy entered Western History with the Jacobins who—save in the one matter of the Leader-Principle—anticipated nearly every feature of our contemporary dictatorships, and from the Jacobins onwards, continental democracy has always betrayed a marked totalitarian strain.¹⁴

⁹"Dictatorship and democracy" (*Queen's Quarterly*, XLVIII, no. 2, 1940). It is interesting to notice how Liberals and Marxists were both led to accept a view of the German and Fascist régimes as mere conspiracies; the first, by their inability to believe that a popular régime can be illiberal; the second, by their denial that a popular régime can be nationalist.

¹⁰A. D. Lindsay, *Essentials of Democracy* (London, 1930).

¹¹Sir Alfred Zimmern, *Modern Political Doctrines* (London, 1939), xv-xvii.

¹²Cf. Oakeshott, *Social and Political Doctrines*, 4.

¹³Dawson, *Beyond Politics*, 41. See also H. Rauschning, *The Redemption of Democracy* (New York, 1941), 49-51.

¹⁴It is significant that Dr. Barker who (*Reflections on Government*, 3-5) "protests *ab initio* against this disjunction of the cause of liberalism from that of democracy," notices that it is mainly continental authorities who make the distinction. He himself realizes (139) that the modern dictators in "the origins from which they start and the

Lastly, under this head, I would recall the distinction which was made by Peter Drucker:¹⁵ the distinction between countries in which liberalism has had little *independent* appeal but has only been accepted because it helped to deliver some specific "good," and countries in which it has been accepted for so long that it has become part of the instinctive habit of mind of a people, quite apart from its actual and present content. Drucker points out that the great experience of both Germany and Italy in the nineteenth century—the cause for which sacrifices were endured, and the cause, therefore, about which German and Italian sentiment could gather—was primarily that of national unification, and only secondarily that of liberalism. Liberal reforms were means to the Nationalist end, and liberal assumptions had little *independent* emotional appeal apart from that end. They had to depend, as it were, on their actual substance and promise, and when these last became invalid, they collapsed.¹⁶

One suggests, therefore, that, for our purpose, the real division is not between democracies and dictatorships, but between those countries in which a Community-State has (for reasons which are, in each case, explicable by national experience), made a deliberate break with the liberal tradition, and those countries in which a Community-State is developing gradually and in which the survival of the liberal idea still favours religious and intellectual liberty. The difference is slight in theory, but, fortunately, considerable in practice. For I hold that it is precisely on such margins of difference that men and women live. Germany and Italy may both—by the careless—be called Fascist, but I suspect that it makes a decisive difference to actual persons living in the two countries whether the Fascism be of the German, or the Italian variety. England and Canada are both called democracies, but, to actual Canadians and Englishmen, it makes a profound difference that in Canada democracy rests on the proposition that A is as good as B, while in England it rests on the mutual willingness of A and B to leave each other alone.¹⁷ Totalitarianism, like every other creed, will become a different thing as it is filtered through the different experience and temper of different nations.

methods by which they arrive, can . . . be acclaimed as in some sense democratic," and he really reduces the question to one of terminology when he says (36) that "democracy which rests merely on the will of number, rests merely on force. If we keep the name and the idea of democracy we must find some other basis. . . . From this point of view it is not the people, as a people, that matter. It is not the majority, as a majority, that matters. It is each human being as such." I can only say that I should call this liberalism, not democracy.

¹⁵Peter Drucker, *The End of Economic Man* (New York, 1939), chap. v.

¹⁶Compare Germany and Italy, in this respect, with England, where the national unity had been so hammered out by the sixteenth century that we have been able to take it for granted ever since; with the result that our emotions have been free to gather about the later struggle for our civil liberties—about our freedoms and not about our unity. Drucker's point will seem even more cogent if we remember that the struggle for our civil liberties not only came *after* the national unity had been assured, but also came *before* the stresses which arose from the industrial revolution, so that English liberals were not called upon (as were liberals in Russia and in Spain), at one and the same time, to carry through the transition from absolutism to constitutionalism, and also to meet the demand for economic democracy. There is our own case in Canada, where social reform has to reckon with the fact that civil liberty is established, but national unity is not.

¹⁷Cf. L. B. Namier, *Conflicts* (London, 1942), 186-96.

II

Assuming then, that our concern is with totalitarianism and not merely with dictatorship; that talk of democracy is irrelevant because democracy can itself be totalitarian; and that totalitarianism has different backgrounds in different countries; we still find three explanations of the decline of Liberalism which—because they do not confine themselves to one country but are international in character—would imply that “it could happen here.”

There are, first, those who equate liberalism with capitalism, and who say that these two rose together and are now falling together.¹⁸ Liberalism, they argue, left two legacies; on the economic side, free-trade capitalism; on the political side, universal suffrage. In the nineteenth century, these two forces could work in harmony, because it was an age of expansion, which meant that the Many were able to use their votes to extract social benefits from the Capitalist State without subjecting it to unbearable strain. Capitalism multiplied wealth, and the masses used the political power conferred on them by the vote, to milk the system of a share of that wealth. The political consequence of Liberalism, universal suffrage, was thus used to redress the balance which had been tilted against the small man by the economic consequence of Liberalism, free-trade capitalism. In short, the vote paid its way. Today, in countries in which there is less and less wealth to be shared, there are obvious limits to the benefits which can be extracted from the Liberal-Capitalist State without destroying both its liberal and its capitalistic character, and for the resultant drift towards state control, the Liberals have no remedy.

Secondly, and complementary to this view that Liberalism *should* give way to socialism, there is the Fascist argument that Liberalism *cannot do other* than develop, first into democracy, and then into socialism. Alfredo Rocco,¹⁹ for example, argues that, having once declared that the goal of society is the welfare and happiness of individuals, Liberals *must* be led on, first, by logic, to admit all individuals to a share in government (democracy), and then, by the pressure of modern industrial conditions, to undertake to organize economic society (socialism). Liberalism begins by limiting the privileges of minorities, but it goes on inevitably to admit the positive rights of majorities. Once give the vote to men who have no property, and you give them the right to share in the benefits distributed by the State. This may be necessary in the interests of social justice, but it ends by destroying Liberalism; for as the State is increasingly called on to distribute largesse to the voters, it can do so only by interfering, to an increasing degree, with the ownership or control of wealth, which means that as the demands of the propertyless increase, so the nature of the steps which even the non-socialist State must take, become increasingly socialistic.

The third explanation of the decline of Liberalism is Christian.²⁰ Christopher Dawson, for example, traces the decline as follows:²¹ Europe's first experience with mass-democracy in the French Revolution was so

¹⁸Cf. L. Dennis, *The Dynamics of War and Revolution* (New York, 1940).

¹⁹Minister of Justice in the Government of Italy. Speech of August 30, 1925, printed in *International Conciliation*, no. 223 (Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, New York).

²⁰E.g. Christopher Dawson, *Progress and Religion* (London, 1937), and *Religion and the Modern State* (London, 1938).

²¹Dawson, *Beyond Politics*, chap. III.

shocking that the post-Revolutionary period began with a double reaction. Genuine Liberals, men such as Royer-Collard, de Tocqueville, Benjamin Constant, recoiled from Jacobin totalitarianism and did all that they could to limit the power of the community as against the individual. For example, while they were hostile to the Church as an embodiment of authority, they valued it as a "separatist" power. They valued it, that is to say, for the same reasons for which the Jacobins had attacked it; because it represented—as a genuine religious body must always represent—a claim to maintain a way of life independent of the State, and because it was, in their view, therefore, a refuge for the individual conscience against totalitarianism. At the same time, the Romantics (for example Coleridge—now, in my opinion, too much neglected) were in reaction not only against the totalitarianism of the revolution but also against the rationalism which was supposed to have produced it, and were looking back towards the mediaeval idea of the State as the servant of the spiritual order. The Romantic movement, however, ran foul of the rationalism of the Utilitarians and of their middle-class supporters, before whom there was opening the prosperity which was promised by *laissez-faire*; and out of the two movements, Liberal and Romantic, there grew the nineteenth-century compromise: individual freedom in economics and religion, stiffened by a quasi-moral faith in progress.

This compromise, Dawson argues, carried the seed of its own destruction. Liberalism succeeded in treating the State merely as the servant of the community, but the Romantics failed to make it the servant of the spiritual power. In practice, it was left free to become the servant of particular material interests, and the fact that, in our time, dissatisfaction with the operation of those interests has compelled the State to interfere in the economic field, makes it more important that the independence of the remaining autonomous orders, the religious and the intellectual, should be safeguarded. Both religion and culture, however, have paid for their freedom from State interference by becoming increasingly divorced from social reality, and Dawson finds them now too devitalized to offer a citadel for the defence of the individual. When the Liberal said that religion was a private matter, he meant that it was important, since, to him, the things of private life were higher than those of the State. When the modern Democrat says the same thing, he means that religion is supremely unimportant.

It is argued, further, that the fact that totalitarianism is an attempt to reimpose unity on society by putting an end to that independence which has been enjoyed by both the economic order and the intellectual order for the last four hundred years, leads us straight to the two points in which *modern* Liberalism has been vulnerable: its identification with the idea of a pre-established economic harmony—what has been called "the plausible ethics of productivity"—, and its association with an optimistic "perfectibilism."

The rational basis of liberalism was Descartes' claim that "there is nothing so far removed from our reach, or so hidden that we cannot discover it, provided only that we refrain from accepting the false for the true, and always preserve in our thinking that order which is necessary for the deduction of one truth from another": and I suppose that, with due emphasis upon the "provided only," some such faith in the power of human

reason sustains all of us in this room. With the eighteenth century, however, rationalism slipped into "perfectibilism," into the belief that Man is naturally good and that his history, therefore, should, and can—if only certain wicked minorities, who are somehow held to be exempt from this natural goodness, can be stopped from perverting it—be one of inevitable and automatic progress towards perfection.²² It slipped, that is, into a creed which, inasmuch as it flies in the face of both history and religion, was plainly *irrational*.

The socialists, of course, have been in revolt against Liberal economics for over a century, but they kept the Liberal perfectibilism and added it to their own doctrine of the class war. As early as the 1830's they were identifying "the people" (held, by definition, to be naturally good) with "the plebs," with the "masses" as against "the classes";²³ and whatever may have been the doctrine of socialist thinkers, this has been the emotional driving force of popular socialism ever since. "Thou hast put down the mighty from their seats and exalted the humble and meek."

This cult of perfectibilism, it is argued, has led to totalitarianism in two ways: first, the disillusioned are always likely to despair too much, and the sharp reminder, in our time, of the presence of evil in the world,²⁴ has thrown our perfectibilist civilization off its balance as it would not have discountenanced a civilization which had remembered that ages of verifiable advance may carry in themselves the seed of ugly lapses, so that there is nothing inevitable and automatic about progress.²⁵ Men who had been taught that reason supplied a basis for belief in automatic progress, are inclined, now that progress is arrested, to deny Reason; and what should be a healthy retreat from perfectibilism has become a flight from Reason itself. That, in turn, means a decline in respect for the individual, "for it is not in the community . . . that reason is enthroned, but in single minds."²⁶

Secondly, it is argued that to separate liberalism from Christianity was to divorce it from its roots. The "credo" of liberalism, the essential dignity and worth of the individual, is not a fact of experience but a dogma of religion. Christianity teaches that men are equal in the sight of God, but we cannot deduce the equality of men from the course of their history. Christianity claims liberty for men, conceived as being made, however imperfectly, in the image of their Maker, but if Man be considered merely as Man, the use which he makes of his liberty is such that, on any secular grounds, there must always be a strong short-term case for taking it away from him; and one reason why I think it worth while to discuss our topic tonight is that 70 per cent of the young men whom I meet accept that case.

²²Cf. I. Babbitt, *Democracy and Leadership* (New York, 1924).

²³Lowes Dickenson, *Revolution and Reaction in Modern France* (London, 1892), chap. IV.

²⁴Now that its "prevalence and obtrusiveness" have been recognized by Dr. C. E. M. Joad, Evil may perhaps be said "to have arrived?" See his palinode, *God and Evil* (London, 1943).

²⁵Cf. Lord David Cecil, "True and False Values" (*Fortnightly*, London, March, 1940).

²⁶W. James, "The Decline of Liberalism" (*Nineteenth Century and After*, CXXX, no. 778, 1941).

III

These three theories are all advanced as being international in scope. It remains to ask whether they have any value when applied on our British "margin of difference"; and it seems to me that in this matter "Know thyself" must also be among the commandments. What has been done in Russia or in Germany is nothing to the point. Our problem is "how to transform the mechanized, dehumanized mass population of an industrialized State into a true community with a common ethos and a common faith."²⁷ Russia has not faced this problem. She has, so far, been mechanizing herself, and doing so in a way which has been as prodigal of her human resources as we in North America were prodigal of our natural resources. She is not yet facing the further problem "of how an already mechanized society is to be physically revitalized and morally re-invigorated." The National Socialists have had to face that problem, but inasmuch as the methods which they have used have been those of mass propaganda (where they have not been those of force) they are, from the liberal point of view, using Satan to cast out sin. We have to find a solution which is consonant with our own character.

The point is important because there is a tendency—too many *émigrés* from the continent have done us a disservice by strengthening that tendency—to import into our affairs the exclusiveness of continental "Right" and "Left" (forgetting that we have never known a Right which was exclusively royalist or clerical, nor a Left exclusively anti-christian or proletarian), and to discuss our problem in terms of the abstractions of international democracy (forgetting that our British freedoms have their own distinctive roots).²⁸

If we resist this tendency, we can count stout assets.²⁹ Our parliamentary system was not borrowed, but has grown in answer to seven hundred years of changing national needs. It is, by nature, non-totalitarian, both of its elements, both crown and parliament, being limited in character. Our parties have never been the organs of unbending orthodoxies, bent on mutual proscription;³⁰ and if they have represented the shifting social and economic elements in our societies, they have only done so to a very incomplete degree. Our tradition has been to leave whole fields of the national life outside the range of State activity and even where the State has begun, of late, to encroach upon those fields, "the State" has meant the Civil Service, whose training until very recently (though this, perhaps, is less true of Canada than of England) has been humanist rather than political. Lastly, our "left" still trails some reminiscences of the Christian tradition; can still speak of human dignity and liberty, as against order, security, and management.

If we keep these assets in mind, it may still seem that the Fascist determinism, which sees Liberalism as unable to help itself, holds good for

²⁷Dawson, *Beyond Politics*, 80.

²⁸Cf. the analysis of the peculiar danger inherent in the ambiguous semi-Marxist, semi-democratic position of a portion of the Left in English-speaking countries, in Barker, *Reflections on Government*, part II, chap. VI.

²⁹Dawson, *Beyond Politics*, 13-14, 38-40.

³⁰It is three hundred years since the iron phrases clanged about the head of Strafford—"the great apostate," "fallen archangel," "stone dead hath no fellow"—and even in our seventeenth century, there was one to say "Yet are our opponents Englishmen; I would not have them whipped into their senses."

us in so far as it embodies the probability that in the sense in which Liberalism was applied in mid-nineteenth century England—as a matter of widening the franchise, extending the area of the “political people,” and opening up to the many what had been reserved for the few—in this sense, Liberalism is probably condemned, as Metternich foresaw, to act as a forerunner, blazing the road for more radical movements which, when their hour has come, dismiss it with a brutal “ôte- toi que je m’y mette.”³¹

Similarly, the socialist theory of the decline of liberalism would seem to embody the truth that unemployment is a test case, with us as elsewhere; and that if our Liberal theory of the nineteenth century is to be valid for more than an *élite*, it requires reasonable equality of opportunity for its basis. Whether that should be taken as a reason for supplying the basis, or as a reason for destroying the Liberalism, seems to be a matter in which our “margin of difference” must count.

For granting the Fascist-Socialist argument that Liberalism is fated to pass into democracy, need it, with us, pass into illiberal democracy? Those who see liberalism as being bound up with capitalism, and as being, therefore, about to disappear, say that man’s social system is determined by his methods of production. If that is so, a society devoted to the production of plenty seems likely to be hierarchic, because large-scale production is a hierarchic matter. Under the capitalist system, that hierarchy has been made tolerable, partly by such freedom of vocational choice as existed, and partly, by the fact that economic and political power were not in the same hands. Put the means of production in the hands of the political power, and that safeguard goes. Would it not seem, then, that the more things are collectivized—i.e., the more Liberalism disappears in the economic sphere—the more vital become our liberties at common law? The more functions are controlled by government, the graver the need for *habeas corpus*, since without that antiseptic, collectivism seems likely to slip into tyranny; and it is surely not unimportant that our civil liberties—what Coke called “somewhat fundamental”—are older with us, and nearer to our daily lives, than any political democracy?

So far as we are concerned, the real danger in the transition from Liberalism to democracy seems to lie in the fact that democracy has not yet developed its own ethic. Without ever formulating the fact into a theory, the enfranchised classes in our nineteenth century did tacitly act upon the assumption that the Liberal State was theirs, that they were its beneficiaries, and that they were under an obligation, therefore, to make it work; and the vast amount of free and unpaid public activity which was so characteristic of our Victorian period was, in effect, a lubricating oil for the machinery of a Liberal State which, otherwise, would have borne too strong a stamp of what Southey called the “cool calculating inhumanity of laissez-faire.” In this respect, it may seem that we are running a race against time, and that it is a question whether the forces which are so abstractedly analysed by Fascists and Socialist will smother our liberalism before our democracy

³¹Liberal prophesy, in this matter, was not happy: John Russell finding a mystic finality in the proposed franchise of 1866; Durham imagining that the Mother Country could part with everything else but retain control of lands and external relations; Morley declaring that if it could be said that his Indian reforms would lead to the establishment of a parliamentary system in India, “he would have nothing at all to do with it.”

has realized—as the middle class realized before it—that the beneficiaries of a régime cannot be absolved from responsibility for its good governance. At present, the two classes most characteristic of industrial society, the “workers” and the “salaried technicians,” still think of government as the concern of “Them” and not of “Us.”

IV

It is partly because Christianity insists that material organization is no substitute for moral order—which is one way of expressing this truth that no constitutional machinery will work unless there is a sufficiently wide-spread conviction that it is important that it *should* work—that I think that the Christian criticism of Liberalism is the most fundamental of the three upon which I have touched. It does appear to be sound as history. The disappearance of the unity which society once derived from a belief in its spiritual purpose—a belief not intellectually apprehended by everyone of course, but assumed in the diffused consciousness of men—did produce a period of what may be called anarchy in the cultural and economic activities of the community. That anarchy was richly productive, but it had less desirable features which were masked for a time by the myth of a pre-established economic harmony and by the myth of human perfectibility, and now that both those myths are exploded, men have taken refuge in another secular religion, the cult of the totalitarian state.

It seems to me, secondly, that the Christian criticism goes to the root of the decline of Liberalism when it attacks perfectibilism.³² Burckhardt prophesied that men who had ceased to believe in “Principles” would soon be found believing in “Leaders,” and so long as perfectibilists ignore the presence of evil in the world, the sequence of over-optimism—disillusionment—despair, seems likely to repeat itself, and likely—whenever it does repeat itself—to be dangerous to liberalism. Once the presence of evil is admitted, we can get on with our liberal task of reducing it to amounts which are spiritually and socially assimilable.

For those who grow restive at the contemporary mention of religion, I should make three caveats. There is no question, of course, of subordinating the State to the Church. Dr. Feiling reminds us that searching the Scriptures half-ruined us in the seventeenth century, and that it is difficult to argue that the New Testament enjoins any particular polity. But he reminds us also that the old alliance of Church and State had its kernel in the State’s recognition of the moralities which were taught by religion; that, there is “a real connection between elemental conscience and external political arrangement; and that, in the last resort, there are moral principles in politics which “sooner or later put forth their tested power.”³³

³²We tend to forget how dominant the perfectibilist myth has been. To every problem in the world there is some superficial solution which, in the last analysis, rests on that myth. Hence, in foreign affairs, the assumption that wars are merely “the fruits of the mistakes of kings and their ministers,” and that “once let the people rule, and they will only will such wars as are just;” hence, in home affairs, the side-tracking of real reform by a teaching which idealizes the have-nots; by the dream of a right-minded proletariat which is assumed, *en masse*, to be superior to those whom it would replace, not only in governmental capacity but also in disinterested devotion.

³³K. Feiling, *What is Conservatism?* (London, 1930).

There can be no question, secondly, of using Christianity as a kind of tonic for a sick society. That would be heresy. It would also be self-defeating, since it would merely "heighten the amount of moral tension without increasing the sources of spiritual vitality."³⁴ Church and State have each their own formal principle, without which they would cease to be themselves, and one cannot ask "sincere men to adopt . . . a religious faith on the grounds of its fruits in earthly politics."³⁵

Thirdly, it must be said that this is not a proposal to exorcise economic problems by waving spiritual banners. To quote Feiling again, "it is impossible to generalize about spiritual values below a certain level of subsistence."³⁶ Fortunately, we are not compelled to choose between alternatives. The Christian says that reformers pay too much attention to economics and too little to original sin. The socialist could reply (or he could, if he were not a perfectibilist) that original sin "makes some men erect their urgent needs into absolute values and other men believe that their . . . control over others is in the order of nature." He could reply that if men pay too much attention to economics, it is because the present economic order is false to its essential purpose, and that the economics of our democracy "are really a form of moral government" in the guise of an economic mechanism. Christian critics of modern Liberalism, therefore, are not looking to some fantastic "extension of the ethics of the Sermon on the Mount to the publicly organized spheres of life";³⁷ but if we believe with Burke, that "never did nature say one thing and wisdom another," if we believe as rationalists that nature works by law and that her law, in the long run, is reasonably ascertainable, then we may believe that it is the business of religion "to discern the regulating principle of the natural and social life of man . . . and to declare where the Natural Law is violated and can be restored in the historical order." Unless it be stiffened by such a religion, it is difficult to be very hopeful about liberalism—considered as a doctrine of the sanctity of the human person. For if only this world be considered, Man appears too often—when the winds arise—as seeking safety in the colour of the Herd.

³⁴Dawson, *Beyond Politics*, 21.

³⁵James, "The Decline of Liberalism."

³⁶The Church of which Elizabeth Tudor was Supreme Governor asserted that "They that are snared and entangled in the utter lack of things needful for the body cannot set their minds upon Thee as they ought to do. . ." (quoted in H. G. Wood, *Christianity and Civilization*, Cambridge, 1942).

³⁷V. A. Demant, "The Importance of Christopher Dawson" (*Nineteenth Century and After*, CXXIX, 1941, 66).

NATIONAL HISTORIC PARKS AND SITES

By the NATIONAL PARKS BUREAU, LANDS, PARKS, AND FORESTS BRANCH,
DEPARTMENT OF MINES AND RESOURCES

THE restoration, preservation, and administration of National Historic Parks and Sites, and the commemoration of the public services of outstanding Canadians is entrusted to the National Parks Bureau. The Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada, an honorary body of recognized historians, representing the various provinces of the Dominion, acts in an advisory capacity to the Bureau in this phase of its work. Judge F. W. Howay of New Westminster, British Columbia, who had been a member of the Board for more than twenty years, and who was appointed Chairman in November, 1941, died on October 4, 1943, at the age of seventy-six. Dr. J. Clarence Webster of Shediac, New Brunswick, succeeded Judge Howay as Chairman, and two new members have been appointed: Professor M. H. Long, Department of History, University of Alberta, and Professor Walter N. Sage, Head of the Department of History, University of British Columbia. The personnel of the Board is as follows: Chairman, Dr. J. Clarence Webster, Shediac, New Brunswick; Professor Fred Landon, London, Ontario; Professor D. C. Harvey, Halifax, Nova Scotia; the Hon. E. Fabre-Surveyer, Montreal, Quebec; J. A. Gregory, M.P., North Battleford, Saskatchewan; the Rev. Antoine d'Eschambault, St. Boniface, Manitoba; Major G. Lanctot, Dominion Archivist, Ottawa, Ontario; Professor M. H. Long, Edmonton, Alberta; Professor Walter N. Sage, Vancouver, British Columbia; W. D. Cromarty, National Parks Bureau, Ottawa, Ontario. A general meeting of the Board, the first since the outbreak of the war, was held in Ottawa on May 19, 20, and 21, when a wide variety of matters relating to the historic background of the Dominion was reviewed and a selection made of sites to be marked at a later date. Of the total number of sites already considered by the Board, 332 have been marked or acquired and 162 recommended for future action.

NATIONAL HISTORIC PARKS

Fort Anne National Historic Park is situated in Annapolis Royal, Nova Scotia. The museum building, restored in 1935, was originally the Officers' Quarters and was built in 1797-8 under the supervision of Edward, Duke of Kent, the father of Queen Victoria, when he was Commander-in-Chief of the British Forces in North America with headquarters at Halifax, Nova Scotia.

During the year the cannon, signs, benches, and the fence posts along the driveway were painted; repairs made to the roadways; iron bars installed on the basement windows of the museum, and other general improvement work carried out. Additional publications and articles of interest were obtained for the museum.

A total of 7,640 signed the museum register during the year.

Port Royal National Historic Park is situated at Lower Granville, Nova Scotia. A replica of the group of buildings which sheltered the first European settlers in Canada has been erected on the exact site where the Port Royal Habitation stood nearly three and a half centuries ago. The original Habitation was the headquarters for about two years of Samuel

de Champlain, famous explorer and chief geographer to Henry IV of France, who chose the location and drew up the plan of settlement.

During the year all interior and exterior woodwork of the Habitation was given a coat of preserving fluid, which has added greatly to its appearance. Approximately forty pieces of furniture, made at the Acadia Forest Experiment Station, Fredericton, New Brunswick, in accordance with designs prepared by Dr. C. W. Jefferys, R.C.A., have been placed in position in the various rooms. The cannon were painted and mounted on a platform; the lawns were rolled and fertilized, and the flagstone walks repaired.

Visitors registered in the park during the year numbered 2,163.

Fortress of Louisbourg National Historic Park is situated about three miles from the town of Louisburg, Cape Breton Island, Nova Scotia. Here were enacted the early stages of the long struggle which culminated in the possession of Canada for the British Crown. Erected more than two centuries ago by the French, who had named the settlement in honour of Louis XIV, King of France, Louisbourg was captured by the British forces in 1745, but was subsequently handed back to the French. The fortress was again besieged by the English and finally captured by them in 1758. It is interesting to recall that one of the brigades of infantry engaged in the recapture of Louisbourg was commanded by General Wolfe, who was later to die heroically at Quebec.

During the year, a new sign depicting the Fortress as it existed in 1745, was carved at the Acadia Forest Experiment Station with a view to having it placed in a suitable position on the grounds. Temporary repairs were made to the entrance road, which was badly damaged during the fall by a heavy storm. All outside woodwork of the museum building and caretaker's quarters was painted, together with the entrance gates, the flag-pole, and the fence enclosing the monument commemorating the capture of Louisbourg.

A total of 2,383 persons signed the visitors' register.

Fort Beausejour National Historic Park is situated near Sackville, New Brunswick. Built by the French, the fort was intended to be an Acadian stronghold against the undefined claims of the English to Acadia. Around the fort the Acadians had their homes and farms. It was captured by the British, under Monckton, in 1755, when the fort was strengthened and its defences extended by a system of entrenchments, traces of which still remain.

During the year the tile drain leading from the basement of the museum was replaced with a larger pipe in order to overcome certain drainage difficulties. Hay was cut and removed from the park; the paths were cleaned and raked, and general improvement work carried out.

Visitors registered at the museum during the year numbered 2,854.

Fort Chambly National Historic Park is situated about twenty miles south-east of Montreal, on a conspicuous headland on the Richelieu River. The first fort, built by the French in 1665 as a protection against the Iroquois, was of wooden construction. After many vicissitudes, it was rebuilt of stone, this work being completed in 1711. In 1760 the fort was surrendered to the British, who, with a small armed force, held it until 1775. In that year the Americans captured the fort; they evacuated in

the following year, but burned everything that was combustible, leaving only the four walls standing. The fort was later repaired and garrisoned by Sir Guy Carleton and played an important part in the War of 1812.

During the year the walls of the fort were repointed where necessary; the window sash painted; trees and shrubs pruned; paths raked and cleaned, and general improvement work carried out.

During the year 9,779 persons signed the museum register.

Fort Lennox National Historic Park is located on Ile-aux-Noix in the Richelieu River, about thirteen miles south of St. Johns, Quebec. The present fort, which stands on the site of one previously erected by the French, was built by the imperial authorities in the period from 1812 to 1827. The island, comprising an area of 150 acres, was acquired by the National Parks Bureau in 1921, and extensive works have since been carried out on the buildings and grounds. The entire property has been in use for war purposes.

Fort Wellington National Historic Park is situated at the east end of the town of Prescott, Ontario, and adjacent to Highway No. 2. The fort, named after the Duke of Wellington, was erected when the British authorities decided to fortify Prescott as one of the most vulnerable points of attack in the War of 1812, and as the main base for the defence of communications between Kingston and Montreal. It remains as it was when finally completed in 1838, an impressive landmark.

During the year the exhibit cases and tables obtained for the museum were painted and new electric fixtures installed; the roof of the guardhouse was repaired and improvements made to the palisades around the fort. The parking area was cleaned and levelled; the inside of the buildings white-washed, and the brush in the moat cut.

A total of 2,403 persons signed the museum register during the year.

Fort Malden National Historic Park is situated in Amherstburg, Ontario. The fort was built in 1797-9 by the Second Battalion Royal Canadian Volunteers. It was strengthened in 1812 as the principal military station on the western frontier and dismantled and abandoned in September, 1813. Only slight evidences of the original fortifications remain.

During the year a tile drain was laid to the moat; the fence at the southern boundary of the park property was repaired; a layer of top dressing was placed on certain parts of the grounds; the ironwork of the fence along the front of the park was painted, and the trees were trimmed. A considerable number of articles of historical interest were added to the museum collection.

A total of 12,308 persons signed the museum register during the year.

Fort Prince of Wales National Historic Park is situated at the mouth of Churchill River, Churchill, Manitoba, and comprises an area of approximately fifty acres. The fort was built from plans drawn by English military engineers, to secure control of Hudson Bay for the Hudson's Bay Company and England. Construction was commenced in 1733 and completed in 1771. It was surrendered to, and partially destroyed by, a French naval force under La Pérouse in 1782. Its ruins, which are among the most interesting military remains on this continent, have been partly

restored and over forty old cannon have been unearthed. Those suitable have been mounted on the walls of the fort.

General supervision was continued throughout the year.

NATIONAL HISTORIC SITES

On the recommendation of the Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada, three standard tablets were erected in the Public Archives of Canada, Ottawa, to commemorate the British Explorers who participated in the Conquest of the Canadian Arctic during the years 1497-1880. These tablets, together with one commemorating the distinguished public services of Douglas Brymner, First Dominion Archivist, were unveiled on May 20, 1943, under the auspices of the Women's Canadian Historical Society of Ottawa. The ceremony was attended by the members of the Historic Sites and Monuments Board, who were holding their annual meeting at the time.

During the year all the sites which have been marked on the advice of the Board were suitably maintained. These include Indian earthworks, forts, and villages; French forts, trading posts, and mission enterprises; sites connected with British exploration and naval and military operations in the long struggle for the possession of Canada; posts of the Hudson's Bay Company, and sites related to the social, economic, and industrial development of the country.

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY

By NORMAN FEE

THE Executive and Council of the Canadian Historical Association met at McMaster University, Hamilton, following the annual meeting in May, 1943, when the Programme Committee, with Mr. A. J. Dorland as Chairman, was named for the year 1944. The annual meeting of Council, was held at Baldwin House, University of Toronto, on November 1 and was well attended. The Chairman of the Committee on the Salvage of Historical Material reported that following the annual meeting in May last, the Committee had prepared a circular letter pointing out that Canadians in their zeal to comply with requests for salvage of all kinds were throwing away old books and newspapers and in some cases family documents, and suggested ways and means to save this material. This letter was sent to local historical societies, libraries, and salvage committees in different centres throughout Canada and was also published in the *Canadian Historical Review* and received notices in the Canadian press. The results were very gratifying and salvage committees are now co-operating with local historical societies and interested persons to save this material. The payment of duty on history books coming into Canada is a question which is raised from time to time. On the suggestion of Mr. Flenley, the Association requested a ruling from the Department of Customs. The letter of the Deputy Minister of National Revenue is as follows:

Ottawa, 26 October, 1943.

Dear Mr. Fee:

I have your letter of the 22nd instant with which you enclosed a copy of letter received by you from Dr. G. W. Brown, President of the Canadian Historical Association, also a copy of a letter written to him by Professor Ralph Flenley, and while tariff item 172 contains a provision for the entry free of Customs duty of books for the promotion of religion, medicine and surgery, the fine arts, law, science, technical training and the study of languages, I think you will agree that history books do not come within the category of this tariff provision.

However, history books which are included in the curriculum of any University, college or school in Canada for use as text books or as works of reference, also those imported to be placed in bona fide libraries and being the property of the organized authorities of such libraries, are free of Customs duty under tariff item 173 and are exempt from sales tax, but are subject to the 10% war exchange tax when imported from Countries such as the United States.

Histories of United States origin which do not qualify for entry under tariff item 173 are dutiable under tariff item 171 at 10% ad valorem. In addition to the Customs duty, there is payable the 8% consumption or sales tax calculated on the duty paid value of the books, as well as the war exchange tax of 10% payable on the value for entry purposes.

Yours faithfully,

D. SIM,

Deputy Minister Customs and Excise.

Norman Fee, Esq., M.C.,
Secretary-Treasurer,
Canadian Historical Association,
Ottawa.

Archives and the problems of collection and care of records were discussed and an Archival Committee with Mr. Brown as Chairman, and the Dominion Archivist and Archivists of the different provinces as members, was appointed. This Committee arranged for a discussion of the subject at the annual meeting and also for a report on the part of microfilms in

archives work. A committee was named at the annual meeting to give publicity to the points raised at this session and to continue the study of archives problems. Mr. A. E. Prince of Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario, was named Chairman of the Programme Committee for 1945.

THE PROGRAMME

The annual meeting of the Canadian Historical Association for 1944 was held in McGill University, Montreal, on June 1 and 2, concurrently with the annual meeting of the Canadian Political Science Association. The following papers were presented: "Some Aspects of the Relations of French Canada with the United States," by Mr. Mason Wade, Quebec; "The Blending of Traditions in Western Canadian Settlement," by Professor G. W. Simpson, University of Saskatchewan; "The Settlement of New Brunswick: An advance toward Democracy," by Mrs. Esther Clark Wright, Acadia University; "Le Régime seigneurial et l'expansion de la colonisation dans le bassin du Saint-Laurent au XVIII^e siècle," by Professor Guy Frégault, University of Montreal; "Colonialism and Nationalism in Canadian Poetry before 1880," by Professor A. J. M. Smith, Michigan State College; "Religious Organization and the Rise of the Canadian Nation, 1850-1885," by Professor S. D. Clark, University of Toronto. A general session was given to the problem of public and other historical records in Canada, at which reports were received with regard to the existing situation in the Public Archives in Ottawa and in each of the provinces. The discussion made clear that there is a more active interest in the question than has been evident for a good many years. Two joint sessions were held with the Canadian Political Science Association. At the first, the presidential addresses were read by Professor George W. Brown, University of Toronto, for the Canadian Historical Association, on "Canada in the Making," and by Professor R. A. MacKay, Dalhousie University, for the Canadian Political Science Association, on "The Social Sciences in the Post-War World." At the other joint session, two papers were read on the subject of "Liberalism in Crisis," by Professor H. N. Fieldhouse, University of Manitoba, and by Professor E. P. Herring, Harvard University.

All the papers mentioned above except those by Professor MacKay and Professor Herring will be printed in the *Report* of the Canadian Historical Association, which is being edited this year by Professor R. M. Saunders of the University of Toronto. The *Report* will also contain a full account of the session on public records.

The Association is indebted to Principal James and the authorities of McGill University for the excellent arrangement and the hospitality which contributed much to the success of the meeting, and also to Professor E. R. Adair, who was chairman of the local arrangements committee.

Officers were elected as follows, for 1944-5: President, Walter N. Sage, University of British Columbia; Vice-President, F. H. Underhill, University of Toronto; English Secretary and Treasurer, Norman Fee, The Public Archives, Ottawa; French Secretary, Séraphin Marion, The Public Archives, Ottawa; Editor of the annual *Report*, R. M. Saunders, University of Toronto; new members of Council, retiring in 1947, R. S. Longley, Acadia University; R. Parent, Department of Labour, Quebec; A. E. Prince, Queen's University; G. W. Simpson, University of Saskatchewan.

REPORT OF THE TREASURER

STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING APRIL 30, 1944

RECEIPTS

April, 1943	Balance on hand.....	\$ 53.70
May 1, 1943, to	Bank Interest.....	1.20
April 30, 1944	Membership Fees and Sale of <i>Reports</i>	1,316.21

DISBURSEMENTS

Cunningham & Co., auditors.....	\$ 10.00	
University of Toronto Press—		
Printing <i>Report</i>	\$403.27	
<i>Canadian Historical Review</i>	530.25	
	933.52	
<i>Bulletin des recherches historiques</i>	74.00	
Canadian Political Science Association.....	106.00	
Administration—		
Clerical assistance.....	\$ 40.00	
Leclerc Printers.....	20.79	
Expenses of Secretary-Treasurer.....	30.00	
Petty Cash, including freight and postage.....	30.00	
	120.79	
Bank Exchange and Operating Charge.....	6.38	
	\$1,250.69	
Balance on deposit, Bank of Montreal—Savings No. 2851.....	120.42	
	\$1,371.11	\$1,371.11

Examined and found correct,

CUNNINGHAM & Co.,
Auditors

NORMAN FEE,
Secretary-Treasurer

Ottawa, May 20, 1944

STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING APRIL 30, 1944

RECEIPTS

April 30, 1943—Balance on hand.....	\$320.55
April 30, 1944—Bank Interest.....	1.60

DISBURSEMENTS

April 30, 1944—Balance on deposit in Bank of Montreal.....	\$322.15	
	\$322.15	\$322.15

Examined and found correct,

CUNNINGHAM & Co.,
Auditors

NORMAN FEE,
Secretary-Treasurer

Ottawa, May 20, 1944

MEMBERSHIP OF THE CANADIAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

(A) AFFILIATED SOCIETIES AND ORGANIZATIONS

- Acadia University Library*, Wolfville, N.S. Mrs. Mary K. Ingraham, Librarian.
- American Antiquarian Society*. Clifford K. Shipton, Librarian, Worcester, Mass.
- Antiquarian and Numismatic Society of Montreal*, Château de Ramezay, 290 Notre-Dame St. E., Montreal. Victor Morin, LL.D., President, 57 rue Sainte-Jacques ouest, Montréal; Pemberton Smith, Treasurer, 414 St. James St. W., Montreal.
- British Columbia Historical Association*. Rev. J. C. Goodfellow, President, Victoria, B.C.; W. E. Ireland, Hon. Treasurer, Victoria, B.C.; Miss H. R. Boutilier, Hon. Secretary, Vancouver, B.C.
- British Museum*, Dept. of Printed Books, London, W.C. 1, England.
- Canadian Military Institute*, 426 University Ave., Toronto, Ont. Col. F. S. McPherson, President; T. J. Jackson, Secretary-Treasurer.
- Clark University Library*, Worcester, Mass., U.S.A. Louis N. Wilson, Librarian.
- Cleveland Public Library*, 325 Superior Ave., N.E., Cleveland, Ohio, U.S.A. Miss Leta E. Adams, Order Librarian.
- Columbia University Library*, New York, N.Y., U.S.A. D. B. Hepburn, Supervisor, Acquisition Department.
- Dartmouth College Library*, Hanover, New Hampshire, U.S.A.
- Geology and Topography Library*, Dept. of Mines and Resources, Ottawa.
- Hamilton Public Library*. Miss Freda F. Waldon, Librarian, Hamilton, Ont.
- Henry E. Huntington Library and Art Gallery*, San Marino, Calif. Leslie E. Bliss, Librarian; Max Farrand, Director of Research.
- Historical Society of Alberta*. W. Everard Edmonds, Secretary, 11146-91st Ave., Edmonton, Alta.; M. H. Long, Treasurer.
- Hudson's Bay Company*, Canadian Committee Office, Winnipeg.
- Indiana State Library*, 140 N. Senate Ave., Indianapolis, Indiana. Kenneth R. Shaffer, Order Librarian.
- Institute of Historical Research*, University of London, London, England.
- Kingston Historical Society*. R. G. Trotter, President; Ronald L. Way, Secretary-Treasurer, Kingston.
- Legislative Library of Ontario*, Toronto, Ont. Legislative Librarian (vacant).
- Library of Congress*, Washington, D.C.
- Library of Parliament*, Ottawa, Ont. F. A. Hardy, Librarian; Félix Desrochers, General Librarian, Ottawa.
- Literary and Historical Society of Quebec*. Col. Wm. Wood, President; D. S. Scott, Recording Secretary; Baron d'Avray, Corresponding Secretary; G. Henshaw, Treasurer.
- London and Middlesex Historical Society*. Hubert J. Trumper, President; Fred Landon, Treasurer, University of Western Ontario, London; H. Orlo Miller, Secretary, Box 571, London, Ont.
- London Public Library*. Richard E. Crouch, Librarian, London, Ont.; James S. Bell, Treasurer.
- McGill University Library*. Gerhard H. Lomer, M.A., Ph.D., F.L.A., Librarian, Montreal, P.Q.
- Montréal, Collège de*, 1931 rue Sherbrooke ouest, Montréal, P.Q.
- Mount Royal High School*, Town of Mount Royal, P.Q.
- National Parks Bureau*, Dept. of Mines and Resources, Ottawa, Ont.
- Norwich Pioneers' Society*. T. H. Pobdon, President; A. L. Bushell, Secretary, Norwich, Ont.
- Nouvel-Ontario*, La Société Historique du Collège du Sacré-Cœur, Sudbury, Ont.
- Nova Scotia Historical Society*. B. E. Paterson, President, c/o Halifax Club, Halifax, N.S.; W. L. Payzant, Secretary.
- Ohio State University, University Library*, Columbus, Ohio, U.S.A.
- Ontario Dept. of Highways*, Fort Henry, Kingston, Ont.
- Ontario Historical Society*. Dr. J. J. Talman, President, University of Western Ontario, London; J. McE. Murray, Secretary-Treasurer, 159 Alcorn Ave., Ottawa, *Société Historique d'*. Louis Charbonneau, Président, Ecole Normale, Université d'Ottawa; R. P. E. Thivierge, Secrétaire, Université d'Ottawa.
- Peterborough Public Library*, Peterborough, Ont.
- Princeton University Library*, Princeton, N.J., U.S.A. Lawrence Heyl, Acting Librarian.

- Provincial Library of Alberta.* Mrs. Frank Gostick, Librarian, Edmonton, Alta.
Provincial Library of British Columbia. Dr. W. Kaye Lamb, Provincial Librarian and Archivist, Parliament Buildings, Victoria, B.C.
Provincial Library of Manitoba. J. L. Johnston, Provincial Librarian, Winnipeg, Man.
Public Archives of Canada, Ottawa.
Québec, Département de l'Instruction Publique, Québec.
Québec, Ministère des Terres et Forêts, Québec.
Queen's University Library. E. C. Kyte, Librarian, Kingston, Ont.
Royal Institute of International Affairs, St. James's Sq., London, S.W. 1, England.
Saguenay, La Société Historique du, Abbé Victor Tremblay, Président; André Lemieux, Secrétaire, Séminaire de Chicoutimi, Chicoutimi, P.Q.
St-Alexandre, Collège de, R1, Pointe Gatineau, P.Q.
Ste-Anne de la Pocatière, Collège de, Ste-Anne de la Pocatière, P.Q.
Ste-Marie, Collège de, 1180 rue Bleury, Montréal, P.Q.
Ste-Thérèse, Séminaire de, Ste-Thérèse, P.Q.
St-Hyacinthe, Séminaire de, St-Hyacinthe, P.Q.
St-Joseph, Université. R.P. H.-A. Vanier, C.S.C., St-Joseph, N.B.
St. Paul's College, Ellice Ave., Winnipeg, Man.
Saskatchewan Historical Society. J. A. Gregory, President; Z. M. Hamilton, Secretary, 403 McCallum Hill Bldg., Regina, Sask.
Thunder Bay Historical Society. J. P. Bertrand, President; D. G. Dewar, Secretary-Treasurer, The Public Library, Fort William, Ont.
Toronto Public Library. Charles R. Sanderson, Chief Librarian, College and St. George Sts., Toronto, Ont.
Trois-Rivières, Séminaire des, Trois-Rivières, P.Q.
Trois-Rivières, Société d'Histoire Régionale de, Séminaire des Trois-Rivières, P.Q.
United College Library. E. M. Graham, Librarian, Winnipeg, Man.
University of British Columbia Library. R. J. Lanning, Librarian, Vancouver, B.C.
University of California Library, Berkeley, Calif., U.S.A. Harold L. Leupp, Librarian.
University of Cincinnati Library, Burnet Woods Park, Cincinnati, Ohio, U.S.A. Edward A. Henry, Director of Libraries.
University of Manitoba Library. Miss Elizabeth Dafoe, Librarian, Winnipeg, Man.
University of Toronto Library. W. S. Wallace, Librarian, Toronto, Ont.
University of Western Ontario, University Library, London, Ont.
Victoria University Library. Miss Emily Keeley, Library Assistant, Toronto, Ont.
Webster Canadiana Library, New Brunswick Museum, Saint John, N.B.
Women's Canadian Historical Society of Ottawa. Mrs. J. R. Dickson, President, 2 Thornton Ave., Ottawa; Mrs. D. Roy Cameron, Recording Secretary, 54 Park Road, Rockcliffe, Ont.; Mrs. Beath Morden, Recording Secretary, 4 Frank St., Ottawa; Miss Dorothy Barber, Treasurer, 223 Somerset St. W., Ottawa.
Women's Canadian Historical Society of Toronto. Miss C. Roberts, President, 20 Earl St., Toronto; Miss Kate Symon, Corresponding Secretary, 68 Avenue Rd., Toronto; Miss Ida M. Smith, Treasurer.
Women's Wentworth Historical Society. Mrs. George Wood Brown, President, 159 Aberdeen Ave., Hamilton, Ont.; Mrs. Bertie D. Smith, Secretary, 284 Hess St. S., Hamilton; Mrs. W. H. Magill, Treasurer.
Yale University Library. Donald G. Wing, Accessions Department, New Haven, Conn., U.S.A.
York-Sunbury Historical Society. Sterling Brannen, Treasurer, P.O. Box 568, Fredericton, N.B.

(B) LIFE MEMBERS

- Bell, Dr. Winthrop, Chester, N.S.
Dow, Miss Jessie, Ritz Carlton Hotel, Montreal
Hardy, Senator A. C., Brockville, Ont.
Hardy, Mrs. A. C., Brockville, Ont.
Hastings, G. V., 55 Donald St., Winnipeg
Hyde, James H., Mountain View House, Whitefield, N.H., U.S.A.
Laurie, W. Pitt, 125 Ave. des Braves, Quebec
Mills, Col. Dudley, 24 Washington House, Basil St., London, S.W. 3, England
Morse, Dr. W. Inglis, 17 Fresh Pond Parkway, Cambridge, Mass.
Musson, Chas. J., 400 Avenue Rd., Toronto

Raymond, L'hon. Donat, 3541, rue Ontario, Montréal
 Riordon, Carl, 374 Côte des Neiges Rd., Montreal
 Ross, Com. J. K. L., 107 St. James St., Montreal
 Smith, Pemberton, 414 St. James St. W., Montreal
 Vaughan, H. H., Dominion Bridge Co., Ltd., Lachine, P.Q.
 Wilson, Hon. Cairine, Rockcliffe, Ont.

(C) ANNUAL MEMBERS

- Adair, E. R., McGill University, Montreal
 Agnew, D. J., 225 College St., N., Sarnia, Ont.
 Aitcheson, J. N., McMaster University, Hamilton, Ont.
 Alberts, Gerald A., 56 Berkeley Ave., Yonkers, N.Y.
 Allard, R.P. J.-A., East Bathurst, Comté de Gloucester, N.B.
 Allard, L'hon. Jules, Palais de Justice, Montréal
 Anderson, William, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.
 Armstrong, Dr. Elizabeth, 2500 Q St., N.W., Washington
 Armstrong, P. C., C.P.R. Co., Montreal
 Arrell, Alex H., Cayuga, Ont.
 Atherton, Dr. W. H., 329 Common St., Montreal
 Atkinson, Miss Isabel, Kerrobert, Sask.
 Ayearst, Morley, New York University, New York, N.Y.
 Bailey, Alfred, University of New Brunswick, Fredericton, N.B.
 Bairstow, E. J., Anaconda American Brass Ltd., New Toronto
 Barbeau, C.-M., 260 McLaren St., Ottawa
 Beaugrand-Champagne, Aristide, 1071 Blvd Mont-Royal, Outremont, P.Q.
 Beer, Lt. W. A., No. 22 C.A.E. (B) T.C., North Bay, Ont.
 Bell, Dr. Winthrop, Chester, N.S.
 Bernier, J.-E., 27, Deuxième Avenue, Iberville, P.Q.
 Berridge, Dr. W. A., Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., 1 Madison Ave., New York, N.Y.
 Beveridge, H. J., 45 Bower Ave., Ottawa.
 Bird, John, *Winnipeg Tribune*, Winnipeg
 Black, Robert Adair, American Bldg., Central Parkway at Walnut, Cincinnati, Ohio
 Bladen, V. W., 273 Bloor St. W., Toronto
 Bland, Rev. Salem, 554 Spadina Ave., Toronto
 Bogart, E. C., 4 Wychwood Park, Toronto
 Bois, H. C., Coopérative Fédérée de Québec, 130 est, rue St-Paul, Montréal
 Bond, Charles Verne, Meta, Kentucky, U.S.A.
 Bonesteel, N. O., Markham, Ont.
 Boothroyd, E. E., Bishop's College, Lennoxville, P.Q.
 Boutilier, Miss Helen R., 976—West 13th Ave., Vancouver
 Brady, Alexander, Economics Building, University of Toronto, Toronto
 Brault, Lucien, Archives nationales, Ottawa
 Brebner, J. Bartlet, Dept. of History, Columbia University, New York, N.Y.
 Brisebois, Napoléon, 1931, rue Centre, Montréal
 Britnell, G. E., Wartime Prices and Trade Board, Ottawa
 Bronson, F. E., 725 Acacia Ave., Rockcliffe, Ont.
 Brouillette, Benoit, 535 avenue Viger, Montréal
 Brown, George W., Baldwin House, University of Toronto, Toronto
 Brown, W. J., 1006 Wellington St., London, Ont.
 Browne, S/L Peter L., Permanent Staff, No. 31, R.A.F., Moncton, N.B.
 Bruchési, Jean, Sous-Secrétaire de la Province, 273 ave. Laurier, Québec
 Burford, W. T., Canadian Federation of Labour, 126A Sparks St., Ottawa
 Burpee, L. J., 22 Rideau Terrace, Ottawa
 Burt, A. L., University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.
 Burwash, Miss Dorothy, 53 Daly Ave., Ottawa
 Callan, Richard, High School of Montreal, 3449 University St., Montreal
 Cameron, Dr. G. S., 318 Stewart St., Peterborough, Ont.
 Campbell, J. A., 2000 Cedar Crescent, Vancouver
 Cantlie, Lt.-Col. G. S., 1106 Sherbrooke St. W., Montreal
 Carmichael, Col. Dougall, 64 Fulton Ave., Ottawa
 Carrière, Joseph M., Box 1383 University Station, Charlottesville, Va.
 Carrothers, W. A., Public Utilities Comm., 510 Central Bldg., Victoria, B.C.
 Carter, Miss Gwendolyn M., Smith College, Northampton, Mass., U.S.A.
 Caty, J. J., Ross Mines, Holtyre, Ont.

(C) ANNUAL MEMBERS—*Continued*

- Chapais, Sir Thomas, Hôtel du Sénat, Ottawa
- Chartier, Mgr, Université de Montréal, 1265, rue St-Denis, Montréal
- Chicoutimi, Séminaire de, Chicoutimi, P.Q.
- Clark, S. Delbert, W. 246th St., Riverdale, New York City, N.Y.
- Clay, Charles, 124 Wellington St., Ottawa
- Clerihue, V. R., 553 Granville St., Vancouver
- Cleverdon, Miss Catherine L., 33 Deshon Ave., Bronxville, N.Y.
- Coats, Dr. R. H., 273 Bloor St. W., Toronto
- Colby, C. W., 1240 Pine Ave. W., Montreal
- Coleman, E. H., Under-Secretary of State, Ottawa
- Conklin, Mrs. W. D., Kingsville, Ont.
- Cooke, A. C., University of British Columbia, Vancouver
- Cooper, H. S., 243 College St., Toronto
- Cooper, John Irwin, McGill University, Montreal
- Corey, Albert B., 439 Kenwood Ave., Delmar, N.Y.
- Coutts, G. B., 517 Seventh Ave. W., Calgary
- Coyne, J. B., 602 Great West Permanent Bldg., Winnipeg
- Crean, J. G., 18 Balmuto St., Toronto
- Creighton, Donald G., Baldwin House, University of Toronto, Toronto
- Crouse, Nellis M., 414 Cayuga Heights Road, Ithaca, N.Y.
- Cudmore, S. A., Dominion Bureau of Statistics, Ottawa
- Cunningham & Co., 165 Sparks St., Ottawa
- Currie, A. W., University of British Columbia, Vancouver
- Dadson, Thomas, Wolfville, N.S.
- Dawson, R. MacG., 273 Bloor St. W., Toronto
- Demers, M. le juge Philippe, Palais de Justice, Montréal
- Dent, C. R., 24 Rowanwood Ave., Toronto
- D'Eschambault, M. l'abbé Antoine, Archevêché de St-Boniface, Man.
- Desranleau, S. Exc. Mgr P., Sherbrooke, P.Q.
- Desrosiers, M. l'abbé Adélar, Principal de l'École Normale, Montréal
- Dewey, A. Gordon, 1 Clark St., Brooklyn, N.Y.
- Dexter, Grant, 130 Acacia Road, Rockcliffe, Ont.
- Dobbin, R. L., 295 Reid St., Peterborough, Ont.
- Dorland, Arthur Garratt, University of Western Ontario, London, Ont.
- Dorrance, Graeme S., Foreign Exchange Control Board, Ottawa
- Duff, Louis Blake, Niagara Finance Company Limited, Welland, Ont.
- Duffett, Walter E., Wartime Prices and Trade Board, Ottawa
- Duguid, Col. A. Fortescue, D.S.O., Historical Section, Dept. of National Defence, 175 Nepean St., Ottawa
- Duhamel, Roger, 3189, rue Maplewood, Apt. 12, Montréal
- Easterbrook, W. T., University of Manitoba, Winnipeg
- Eastman, S. Mack, University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon
- Eastwood, Austin, West Bank, Baghdad, Iraq
- Edwards, Manley J., House of Commons, Ottawa
- Ells, Miss Margaret, Public Archives of Nova Scotia, Halifax
- Ewart, T. S., 6 Lakeview Terrace, Ottawa
- Fabre-Surveyer, L'hon. juge E., 128, avenue Maplewood, Outremont, P.Q.
- Fee, Norman, Public Archives of Canada, Ottawa
- Ferland-Angers, Mme A., 251 Milton St., Apt. 33, Montreal
- Field, H. H., 49 Chrysler Ave., Ottawa
- Fieldhouse, H. N., Dept. of History, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg
- Firestone, O. J., Annex, Room 313, Daly Bldg., Ottawa
- Flenley, R., Baldwin House, University of Toronto, Toronto
- Foran, Mrs. T. P., 147 Wilbrod St., Ottawa
- Forsey, A. E., 3 Lakeview Terrace, Ottawa
- Fortier, F., 1127 rue Parc Lafontaine, Montreal
- Foster, Miss Joan, Trafalgar School for Girls, Montreal
- Franklin, Harry L., 2700 Q Street N.W., Kew Gardens, Apt. 317, Washington, D.C.
- Fraser, Clarence, Bell Telephone Co., 76 Adelaide St. W., Toronto
- Frumhartz, Miss Esther, 503 Crawford St., Toronto
- Gamble, C. L., 212 Park Ave., Brantford, Ont.

(C) ANNUAL MEMBERS—*Continued*

- Gamsby, G. A., 381 Kingston Crescent, St. Vital, Man.
- Garland, Rev. M. A., University of Western Ontario, London, Ont.
- Garneau, Sir J. Georges, 136 Grande Allée, Québec
- Garton, P. Douglas, 414 St. James St., Montreal
- Gates, Mrs. Paul, 421 Mitchell St., Ithaca, N.Y.
- Gelley, T. F., Royal Military College, Kingston
- Gibb, Harley L., 2380 Cortland Ave., Detroit, Mich.
- Gibson, A. R., 243 Warren Rd., Toronto
- Gibson, Frederick W., 151 Union St. W., Kingston, Ont.
- Gibson, James A., Dept. of External Affairs, Ottawa
- Gibson, J. D., Bank of Nova Scotia, 39 King St. W., Toronto
- Glass, Sub-Lt. Ogden, H.M.C.S. "Kings", c/o F.M.O., R.C.N.V.R., Halifax
- Glazebrook, G. deT., Dept. of External Affairs, Ottawa
- Gordonsmith, C., 371 Claremont Ave., Montreal
- Graham, Gerald S., Royal Naval College, Victoria, B.C.
- Grant-Suttie, Lt.-Col. G. L. P., 110 St. George St., Toronto
- Gravel, C.-E., 3570, rue McTavish, Montréal
- Griffin, John William, 101 Douglas Drive, Toronto
- Groulx, M. l'abbé Lionel, 261, avenue Bloomfield, Outremont, P.Q.
- Guertin, R.P. L., C.S.C., Université Saint-Joseph, St-Joseph, N.B.
- Guilday, Rev. Peter, 305 Mullen Memorial Library, Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C.
- Hamilton, Louis, 2 Ladbroke Grove House, London, W. 11, England
- Harrison, W. E. C., Queen's University, Kingston, Ont.
- Harriss, C. Lowell, 608 Shadowlawn, Dayton, Ohio, U.S.A.
- Hart, C. W. M., 273 Bloor St. W., Toronto
- Harvey, Hon. Chief Justice, 10226 Connaught Drive, Edmonton
- Harvey, Daniel C., Public Archives of Nova Scotia, Halifax
- Harwood, C. A. de Lotbinière, 475 Argyle Ave., Westmount
- Havens, Edmund G., 616 Allison Drive, Ann Arbor, Mich., U.S.A.
- Hay, L. Hamilton, 1898 Dorchester St., Apt. 4, Montreal
- Heaton, Herbert, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.
- Helleiner, K. H., 273 Bloor St. W., Toronto
- Helstrom, Theodore, Box 27, Gray, Sask.
- Hewson, C. G., West Hill High School, N.D.G., Montreal
- Hitchins, Fred H., 503 English St., London, Ont.
- Hodgetts, A. B., Trinity College School, Port Hope, Ont.
- Holbrook, Dr. J. H., Medical Supt., Mountain Sanatorium, Hamilton
- Holmes, John W., 1 Frank St., Ottawa
- Hudson, A. B., Supreme Court, Ottawa
- Hyde, James H., Mountain View House, Whitefield, N.H., U.S.A.
- Innis, Harold A., Economics Bldg., University of Toronto, Toronto
- Ireland, Willard E., Provincial Library and Archives, Victoria, B.C.
- James, F. Cyril, McGill University, Montreal
- Jefferys, Charles W., York Mills, Ont.
- Jennings, F. C., Librarian, Carnegie Library, Ottawa
- Johnston, J. G., Northern Ontario Bldg., Toronto 2, Ont.
- Johnston, Robert A. A., 112 Old Forest Hill Rd., Toronto
- Jones, Robert L., Ph. D., Marietta College, Marietta, Ohio
- Kains, A. C., 9 Rideau Gate, Ottawa
- Kenney, J. F., Public Archives of Canada, Ottawa
- Kerr, D. G. G., 6171 Sherbrooke St. W., Apt. 1, Montreal
- Ketcheson, Fred G., 123 Glendale Ave., Toronto
- Kinchen, Oscar A., Texas Technological College, Lubbock, Texas
- King, Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie, Ottawa
- Kinnear, Miss Muriel, Public Archives of Canada, Ottawa
- Kirkconnell, Watson, McMaster University, Hamilton
- Knox, F. A., Queen's University, Kingston
- Lacey, Douglas R., U.S. Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md.
- Laflamme, M. l'abbé Eug.-C., 16, rue Buade, Québec
- Laing, Dr. L. H., 1922 Day St., Ann Arbor, Mich.
- Laird, David H., K.C., 400 Victory Bldg., Winnipeg

(C) ANNUAL MEMBERS—*Continued*

- Lamb, W. Kaye, University of British Columbia, Vancouver
- Lancot, Gustave, Archives publiques du Canada, Ottawa
- Landon, Fred, 846 Hellmuth Ave., London, Ont.
- Lebel, Paul, 70 St. Germain St., Quebec
- Lefebvre, Olivier, 59 est, rue Notre-Dame, Montréal
- Leonard, Col. Ibbotson, 782 Wellington St., London, Ont.
- Leslie, James W., 1716 Springfield Ave., Côte St. Paul, Montreal
- Long, Mrs. Ernest E., 663 Dollard Blvd., Outremont
- Long, Morden H., University of Alberta, Edmonton
- Longley, R. S., Dept. of History, Acadia University, Wolfville, N.S.
- Longstaff, Major Frederick Victor, Seabank, 50 King George Terrace, Victoria
- Lower, A. R. M., United College, Winnipeg
- Lunn, Miss Jean, 458 Argyle Ave., Westmount, P.Q.
- McCallum, John E., 24 Wilberton Road, Toronto
- McCulley, Joseph, Pickering College, Newmarket, Ont.
- MacDermot, Major T. W. L., Directorate of Personnel Selection, Department of National Defence, Army, Ottawa
- MacDonald, Rev. J. A., St. Francis Xavier University, Antigonish, N.S.
- Macdonald, Norman, Dept. of History, McMaster University, Hamilton, Ont.
- MacFarlane, Major R. O., Royal Military College, Kingston, Ont.
- MacGibbon, D. A., Board of Grain Commissioners, Winnipeg
- Machum, L. A., 303 Cameron St., Moncton, N.B.
- McIlwraith, T. F., Royal Ontario Museum, Toronto
- MacInnes, C. M., University of Bristol, Bristol, England
- McInnis, Edgar, University of Toronto, Toronto 5, Ont.
- MacKay, R. A., Dept. of External Affairs, Ottawa
- MacKenzie, N. A. M., University of New Brunswick, Fredericton
- Mackintosh, W. A., Queen's University, Kingston
- MacLaren, C. H., 14 Metcalfe St., Ottawa
- MacLean, Rt. Rev. Mgr. Donald A., Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C.
- McLennan, F. D., Drawer 908, Cornwall, Ont.
- McLeod, J. A., Bank of Nova Scotia, 38 Melinda St., Toronto
- Macleod, J. E. A., 323 Fourth Ave. W., Calgary
- Magrath, C. A., 841 St. Charles St., Victoria
- Maheux, M. l'abbé Arthur, Archiviste, Université Laval, Québec
- Major, T. G., 315 Fairmont Ave., Ottawa, Ont.
- Malchelosse, Gérard, 5759, avenue Durocher, Montréal
- Mallory, J. R., 273 Bloor St. W., Toronto
- Manny, Miss Louise, Newcastle, Miramichi, N.B.
- Marin, C. H., 675 Dorchester St. W., Montreal
- Marion, Séraphin, Archives nationales, Ottawa
- Marsh, Donald B., Barnard College, Columbia University, New York, N.Y.
- Martell, J. S., Public Archives of Nova Scotia, Halifax
- Martin, Chester, Baldwin House, University of Toronto, Toronto
- Massey, Hon. Vincent, Canada House, London, S.W. 1, England
- Masters, D. C., United College, Winnipeg
- Matthews, W. D., Dept. of External Affairs, Ottawa
- Maurault, Mgr Olivier, 1000 est, boulevard Crémazie, Montréal
- Mercer, Malcolm J., 106 LeMarchant Road, St. John's, Nfld.
- Miller, Harry, 63 Merton Road, Hampstead, P.Q.
- Milne, C. V., 829 Royal Ave., Calgary, Alta.
- Milner, Frank L., K.C., P.O. Box 263, Amherst, N.S.
- Minville, E., Écoles des Hautes Études Commerciales, 535, avenue Viger, Montréal
- Monahan, F., 1844 Allison Road, Vancouver
- Morgan, F. Cleveland, 308 Peel St., Montreal
- Morin, Victor, 57 ouest, rue Saint-Jacques, Montréal
- Morin, Wilfred Laurier, 1302 John Jay Hall, Columbia University, New York, N.Y.
- Morton, Arthur S., University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon

(C) ANNUAL MEMBERS—*Continued*

- Morton, W. L., University of Manitoba, Winnipeg
 Mott, Miss K. Stella, R.R. No. 3, Norwich, Ont.
 Mullally, Dr. Emmet J., 2021 Union Ave., Montreal
 Mulock, Sir William, Toronto
 Munro, W. B., 268 Bellefontaine St., Pasadena, Cal.
 Munroe, David, Ormstown Academy, Ormstown, P.Q.
 Murphy, Miss Ethel, 106 Gordon St., Moncton, N.B.
 Murray, Miss Jean E., University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon
 Murray, S. G., 273 Bloor St. W., Toronto
 Murray, W. H., 36 Churchill Ave., Westmount, P.Q.
 Myers, Leslie P., 89 Durie St., Toronto

 Nadeau, Dr. Gabriel, Rutland State Sanatorium, Rutland, Mass.
 New, Chester W., McMaster University, Hamilton, Ont.
 Newfield, I. G., 68 Don Crest Road, Toronto 6, Ont.

 Papineau, Mgr, Evêché de Joliette, Joliette, P.Q.
 Parent, Raymond, L'archiviste-bibliothécaire, Ministère du Travail, Québec
 Parizeau, Gérard, 10 Avenue Glencoe, Outremont
 Park, Lt. J. D., R.C.N.V.R., 39½ Edward St., Halifax, N.S.
 Peardon, Thos. P., Columbia University, New York, N.Y.
 Petrie, J. R., P.O. Box 966, Fredericton, N.B.
 Pickersgill, J. W., Dept. of External Affairs, Ottawa
 Pierce, Lorne, The Ryerson Press, Toronto
 Potvin, M. l'Abbé Pascal, Archives, Université Laval, Québec
 Pouliot, R.P. Léon, 1855 est, rue Rachel, Montréal
 Preston, Anthony W., Bishop's University, Lennoxville, P.Q.
 Prince, A. E., Queen's University, Kingston
 Pritchett, John Perry, Queen's College, College of the City of New York, New York, U.S.A.

 Raphael, Leslie Allan, 2150 West 35th Ave., Vancouver
 Reaman, G. E., Dept. of English, Ontario Agricultural College, Guelph

 Reid, Miss Allana, 152 Hillcrest Ave., Montreal West, P.Q.
 Reid, Escott M., Dept. of External Affairs, Ottawa
 Reid, R. L., K.C., 1736 Wesbrook Crescent, Vancouver
 Reid, W. S., 4330 Delorimier Ave., Apt. 3, Montreal, P.Q.
 Reynolds, C. Murray, Van Houten Block, 16 Commercial St., Nanaimo, B.C.
 Richardson, A. J. H., 16 Cooper St., Ottawa
 Riddell, R. G., Dept. of External Affairs, Ottawa
 Riddell, Hon. Mr. Justice W. R., Osgoode Hall, Toronto
 Rife, C. W., Hamline University, St. Paul, Minn.
 Rimouski, S. Exc. Mgr l'évêque de, Rimouski, P.Q.
 Robbins, Dr. J. E., 166 Marlborough Ave., Ottawa
 Roberts, Miss D. M., 3230 Westmount Blvd., Westmount, P.Q.
 Robertson, C. J., 1441 Drummond St., Montreal
 Robinson, Percy J., Box 102, Aurora, Ont.
 Roe, Frank Gilbert, 11919-105th St., Edmonton
 Rosenberg, L., 25B Balfouria Apt., Winnipeg
 Ross, Miss Aileen D., 273 Bloor St. W., Toronto
 Ross, Miss Dorothy, 367 Metcalfe Ave., Westmount
 Ross, S. Exc. Mgr F. X., Evêque de Gaspé, Gaspé, P.Q.
 Ross, John T., 110 St. Peter St., Quebec
 Rothney, Gordon O., 1441 Drummond St., Montreal
 Roy, Antoine, rue Gomin, Québec
 Roy, Ferdinand, Palais de Justice, Québec
 Roy, Pierre-Georges, 44, rue Wolfe, Lévis, P.Q.

 Sage, Lt. Donald, Dept. of National Defence, 175 Nepean St., Ottawa
 Sage, W. N., University of British Columbia, Vancouver
 Samuel, Dr. Sigmund, 104 Forest Hill Rd., Toronto
 Sanderson, Charles R., Chief Librarian, Toronto Public Library, Toronto
 Sandwell, B. K., *Saturday Night*, Toronto
 Saunders, Richard M., Baldwin House, University of Toronto, Toronto
 Saunders, Robert, 5 Winter St., St. Paul, Minn., U.S.A.

(C) ANNUAL MEMBERS—*Continued*

- Saunders, S. A., 143 Spadina Road, Toronto
- Savelle, Max, Stanford University, Cal.
- Schuyler, R. L., Columbia University, New York, N.Y.
- Scott, F. R., McGill University, Montreal
- Scott, S. Morley, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
- Shiels, Archie W., Pacific American Fisheries, South Bellingham, Wash.
- Sifton, Victor, *Winnipeg Free Press*, Winnipeg
- Simpson, Geo. W., University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon
- Sissons, C. B., Victoria College, Toronto
- Sjostedt, Mrs. Jessie Winslow, 237 Chapel St., Ottawa
- Skilling, H. G., Univ. of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.
- Slavet, Joseph, 7 Lorna Road, Mattapan, Mass.
- Smedley, Miss Florence, 351 Mercille Ave., St. Lambert, P.Q.
- Smith, G. M., Dept. of History, University of Alberta, Edmonton
- Smith, H. Greville, Canadian Industries Ltd., Box 1260, Montreal
- Smith, Joe Patterson, Illinois College, Jacksonville, Ill.
- Somerville, Mrs. J. M., Kenniston Apts., Ottawa
- Soward, F. H., Dept. of History, University of British Columbia, Vancouver
- Spragge, G. W., 84 Gormley Ave., Toronto
- Spry, Mrs. Graham, 85 John St., Ottawa
- Stacey, Major C. P., Canadian Military Headquarters, London, England
- Stanley, Major G. F. G., Canadian Military Headquarters, London, England
- Steadman, T. Park, Sandwich Collegiate Inst., Windsor, Ont.
- Stewart, Kenneth, 529 Osborne Ave., Verdun, P.Q.
- Stitt, James H., 396 Third Ave., Ottawa
- Strange, H. G. L., c/o Searle Grain Co., Winnipeg
- Swannell, Frank, 564 Dallas Rd., Victoria
- Talman, James J., University of Western Ontario, London, Ont.
- Tanguay, Dr. Rodolphe, 19 Durham St., Sudbury, Ont.
- Tapscott, C. S., Court House, Brantford
- Taschereau, L'hon. L.-A., 187 Grande Allée, Québec
- Thomas, Lewis H., 324—20th St. East, Saskatoon
- Thomson, G. C., Barrister-at-law, Swift Current, Sask.
- Tombs, Guy, 1111 Beaver Hall Hill, Montreal
- Tombs, L. C., 503 Mount Pleasant Ave., Westmount, P.Q.
- Tomlinson, C. P., 3940 Côte des Neiges Rd., Montreal
- Tory, Dr. H. M., 327 Buena Vista Road, Rockcliffe Park, Ottawa
- Tremblay, Maurice, Edifice de la Banque Royale, 360 ouest, rue St-Jacques, Montréal
- Trigge, A. St. L., P.O. Box 121, Melbourne, P.Q.
- Trotter, Reginald G., Queen's University, Kingston
- Tucker, Gilbert Norman, 100 Redpath St., Ottawa
- Turner, J. H., 567 King St., Peterborough, Ont.
- Tweed, T. W., 47 South Drive, Toronto
- Tyrrell, J. B., 14 Walmer Rd., Toronto
- Underhill, Frank H., Baldwin House, University of Toronto, Toronto
- Van Alstyne, Richard W., Chico State College, Chico, Calif., U.S.A.
- Vaughan, Mrs. O. D., 135 St. Germain Ave., Toronto
- Waines, W. J., University of Manitoba, Winnipeg
- Walter, T. Dayman, 2442 Gladstone Ave., Windsor, Ont.
- Ward, Norman, 219 Fairleigh Ave. S., Hamilton, Ont.
- Ward, Mrs. S. N., Agincourt, Ont.
- Way, Ronald L., 165 Division St., Kingston
- Webster, Dr. J. C., Shediac, N.B.
- Weir, Miss M. F., Sarnia Collegiate Institute and Technical School, Sarnia, Ont.
- Weir, S. E., K.C., Bank of Commerce Bldg., Dundas and Richmond Sts., London, Ont.
- Westman, L. E., 295 Riverside Drive, Toronto
- Whitelaw, W. M., University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon
- Wilk, Pfc Joseph A., A.A.F., W.T.T.C., 1108-15th St., Denver 2, Col.
- Williams, David, Collingwood, Ont.
- Williams, E. K., Huron and Erie Bldg., Winnipeg
- Williams-Taylor, Sir Frederic, Bank of Montreal, Montreal
- Willis, John, Dalhousie University, Halifax

(C) ANNUAL MEMBERS—*Continued*

- | | |
|--|--|
| Wills, Harold A., c/o Northland Post,
Cochrane, Ont. | Woodley, E. C., Dept. of Education,
Parliament Bldgs., Quebec |
| Wilson, George E., Dalhousie University,
Halifax | Woods, H. D., United College, Winnipeg |
| Winkler, H. W., Morden, Man. | Woodyatt, James B., 355 St. James St.
W., Montreal |
| Winslow, Edward Pelham, Chateau Apts.,
C 41, 1321 Sherbrooke St. W., Montreal | Wright, Mrs. E. C., 82 Waterloo Row,
Fredericton |
| Winter, Carl G., 226 N. Tyndall Ave.,
Tucson, Ariz. | Wrong, G. M., 73 Walmer Rd., Toronto |
| Wittke, Carl F., Oberlin College, Oberlin,
Ohio | Wrong, H. H., Dept. of External Affairs,
Ottawa |
| Wood, Col. Wm., 59 Grande Allée,
Quebec | Younge, Miss Eva, 273 Bloor St. W.,
Toronto |

(29)
8094 - H 5k

Date Due

NOV 17 1990

[illegible]

TRENT UNIVERSITY



0 1164 0194683 9

F5000 .C26 1944

Canadian Historical Assoc
Rapport...

113196

RESERVE

Reserve:

Canadian

113196

113196

